



**Departmental Library**  
**Comparative Literature**  
**Jadavpur University**

**JADAVPUR**  
**JOURNAL**  
**OF**  
**COMPARATIVE**  
**LITERATURE**

*Journal of Comparative Literature*

Department of Comparative Literature,

publications of sister institutions and departments,

associations, will be gratefully received in exchange.

review copies of outstanding scholarly and literary works

in all languages, including English, French and German, but we do not under-

stand to publish reviews of all titles received.

communications should be

to the Editor of *Journal of Comparative Literature*.

*Journal of Comparative Literature* will be a

quarterly publication, and each annual number will cost

Rs. 7.50, 2.00, 50d, 6DM, 6fr, 2 Roubles.

Subscription is to

DAVID MCCUTCHON	
<i>Comparative Literature in France</i>	1
ROBERT ANTOINE, S.J.	
<i>Classical Forms of the Simile</i>	11
J. MASSON	
<i>Yeats's The Ten Principal Upanishads</i>	24
ଅନୁବାଦ: ଡଃ ଦୟାନନ୍ଦ ପ୍ରସାଦ ମହାନ୍ତି ଉପାଧ୍ୟକ୍ଷାବଳୀପାଠ୍ୟ ପ୍ରଣେତା	
AMAL BHATTACHARJI	
<i>Euripides and the Disintegration of the Tragic Form : A study of Iphigenia in Aulis</i>	54
KELLY DATTA	
<i>Love and Asceticism in Donne's Poetry : The Divine Analogy</i>	73
BOOK REVIEW	
Robert Antoine, S.J.	99
ପ୍ରତିକ୍ଷା ପ୍ରାଣେଶ୍ୱରୀ	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
<i>Works of Rabindranath Tagore : English</i>	
Compiled by Pulinbihari Sen and Sobhanlal Ganguli	114
JJCL NOTES	131

## COMPARATIVE LITERATURE IN FRANCE

In France as in other countries the comparative study of different literatures was practised in literary journalism and debate long before it became academically established. Its origin may be traced to the Renaissance, when the catholic universalism of the Middle Ages gave way to the recognition of diversity, and at the same time the different national literatures of Europe began their vigorous growth. The discovery of the Greek and Roman 'Ancients' was paralleled in the 18th and 19th centuries by what Maurice Schwab has called the 'Oriental Renaissance'—the discovery of ancient Indian and other Eastern literatures—and on a smaller scale by lively interchange between the variously developing literatures of Europe itself: French classicism in England, German Romanticism in France. Comparative Literature would involve all those intermediaries like Voltaire writing on England or Mme. de Staël on Germany, who introduced their fellow-countrymen to alien literary traditions. But the 17th and 18th century ventures into the comparative field are marred by ignorance and partisanship—Voltaire praising the Brahmins in order to denigrate the Christians, or preferring Ariosto and Tasso to Homer for their greater delicacy and grace.<sup>1</sup> The neo-classical debate between Ancients and Moderns arising from the premise of universal literary standards (which replaced the universal Christian standards of the Middle Ages), gave way at the end of the 18th century to that multiplicity in unity which is Goethe's concept of *Weltliteratur*.<sup>2</sup> It is not surprising therefore that in spite of the incomparable broadening of horizons that took place in Europe between the Renaissance and the 18th century, it was not until the second quarter of the 19th century that truly comparative studies began, of which the essential spirit is objectivity. Up to then Shakespeare, for instance, was either a barbarian to classicists like Voltaire, or in Germany a stick with which to beat the French; Hugo's

*Preface to Cromwell*, or Stendhal's *Racine and Shakespeare* (1823) are not so much Comparative Literature as battle cries.

The first teacher of Comparative Literature in France was Abel Villemain, who gave a course at the Sorbonne in 1828 entitled 'The influence of French 18th century writers on other literatures and the European spirit.' This covered both reciprocal influences between France and England, and the influence of France on Italy. Two years later, Jean-Jacques Ampère gave a course of lectures at Marseilles on Northern European poetry from the *Edda* to Shakespeare. Called to the Sorbonne in 1832, Ampère gave an inaugural lecture entitled 'French literature in its relations with other literatures in the Middle Ages,' and then threw down a challenge: 'We will do it, gentlemen, this comparative study, without which literary history is not complete; and if, as a result of the juxtapositions to which this study leads us, we find that any foreign literature is better than ours in some point, we will recognize, we will equitably proclaim this advantage.' Another early comparatist was Philurète Chasles, who taught at the Collège de France from 1841 to -73, where he combined in a single course not only the literature, but also the history, philosophy and politics of different nations, taking as his article of faith: 'Everybody borrows from everybody else: this great labour of sympathies is universal and constant.' These early pioneers were ardent liberals and internationalists, consciously reacting against the chauvinistic classical tradition of the 18th century. Their courses were inspired more by enthusiasm perhaps than depth—'leaping from peak to peak' as Paul van Tieghem describes them—a little vast and vague—but they created the necessary climate of opinion for developing the comparative attitude. About this time the first comparative studies appear: *A Comparative History of the Spanish and French Literatures* by Adolphe de Puibusque in 1843, *The Influence of Italy on French Letters, from the 13th century to the Reign of Louis XIV* by E.J.B. Rathery in 1853, or *Corneille, Shakespeare and Goethe* by W. Reymond in 1864. The movement received the influential support of Sainte Beuve, who wrote an article on Ampère,<sup>3</sup> and a Preface to Reymond's book. The new approach was also taken up by Amédée Duquesnel's *History of Literature* (1836-44), which in its 1845 edition was subtitled 'Course of Comparative Literature'. In 1855 the first of many books on *Shakespeare and the French Theatre* appeared, and from the 1860s an increasing number of doctoral theses in Modern Literature take up comparative topics.

All this time there was no chair of Comparative Literature at any

French university. Early comparatists, like Edgar Quinet at Lyons or Xavier Marmier at Rennes, occupied chairs of 'Littératures Etrangères'—akin to the Mediaeval and Modern Languages faculties of England. Others, like Brunetière at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in 1890-91, or Gustave Lanson, were invited to give special courses. The first chair of Comparative Literature in France was created at Lyons University in 1896, some thirty years after the first in Italy (Naples, 1863) and Switzerland (Geneva, 1865). The chair at the Sorbonne in Paris, which is so well-known today, was not established till 1910—later than Columbia (1899), Harvard (1904) and Dartmouth College (1908) in the United States. Strasbourg came next in 1919. Gradually other universities followed suit, until by 1867 all except Caen and Rouen had one or several chairs, especially since the Certificate of Comparative Literature became an optional paper for the Licence, and the Agrégation in Modern Literature also offers much comparative scope. From its beginnings as a fashionable stance of the Romantics, Comparative Literature has attained entire respectability: 'France is the only country in the world offering comparative studies at all (or almost all) levels of education.'<sup>4</sup> The distinguished *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, published from the Sorbonne, was established by Fernand Baldensperger and Paul Hazard in 1920—long after the American *Journal of Comparative Literature* (Columbia, 1908), but it had been preceded by the *Revue Latine* edited by Emile Faguet, which was subtitled 'Journal of Comparative Literature', and indeed by the much more famous if less academic *Revue des Deux Mondes*. The *Revue de Littérature Comparée* was accompanied by a series of publications—the *Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée*—which by 1939 comprised more than 120 full length volumes. Since the end of the last war, more than two hundred theses in Comparative Literature have been entered at the Sorbonne alone, and bibliographical lists run into thousands. In 1954 was founded the Société Nationale Française de Littérature Comparée, which has since held two congresses every three years.<sup>5</sup>

From the very beginning Comparative Literature in France was much preoccupied with 'influences'—Heine in France, Rousseau in England, Scott on the Continent—so much so that this came to be characterized as the 'French' approach, as distinguished from the American 'aesthetic' approach, or the German fascination for *Stoffgeschichte*—the migration and transformation of themes, symbols, *topoi* and the like. This was the French solution to the charge of vagueness and Romantic

Humanism levelled against the early practitioners: to tie the whole subject down only to that which can be objectively established. Thus in France the word 'comparison' became a misnomer, for the purpose was not to compare but to establish connections. Arius-François Guyard puts it in his little book on Comparative Literature: 'My teacher, Jean-Marie Carré, following Paul Hazard and Fernand Baldensperger, believed that where there was no connection—from a man to a text, from a work to a receptive milieu, from a country to a traveller—the domaine of Comparative Literature cease and that of literary criticism began, not to say rhetoric.'<sup>6</sup> According to Guyard, the correct name for the subject should be: 'History of International Literary Relations'. For Carré even influences are not definite enough (who knows what a man may or may not have read!): more certain is the history of the success of a work or writer, the destiny of a great figure, the reciprocal interpretations of peoples. He rejects all study of parallels, whether synchronous or not, all periodization and classification as into Romantics or humanists, as 'all too prone to fall into abstraction, arbitrariness, or mere naming.' Thus for Carré or Guyard, a comparison between Shakespeare and Racine is 'criticism or eloquence': the task of the comparatist is to find out, for example, what Shakespeare knew of Montaigne and how much of Montaigne went into his works. This would involve listing all the ideas, images, phrases, common to both authors, finding out whether Shakespeare knew French and if not what translations were available and in what libraries to which Shakespeare might have had access, and whether those ideas, images, phrases, were also commonplace in other English writings of the time, how Montaigne was regarded by Shakespeare's contemporaries, how widely referred to, and whether any of those ideas, images, phrases might have come into Shakespeare's mind from a common source outside Montaigne, and so forth. Thus the major emphasis of Comparative Literature in France has been on media—'an inventory is the first task,' as Guyard declares—an inventory of all the media whereby an influence may spread: books, translations, journals, newspapers, letters, diaries, conversation of travellers. ... This has led to a great deal of work in the musty files of defunct magazines or unpublished family records or early libraries, resulting in bibliographies of translations, or studies such as that of Paul van Tieghem on the *Année Littéraire* (1754-90) 'as an intermediary in France of foreign literatures.' Considerable stress is laid upon assessing the respective impact of writers in their original languages and in translation—for instance Walter Scott



in France and Germany: was he read in English, French or German? How well did Goethe or Balzac know English? This leads to a study of the early 19th century book trade in Paris—pirated editions and hack translating. This may become a matter of great importance, as for Shakespeare when Desdemona's handkerchief becomes a lock of hair and Othello must stab her with a dagger rather than manipulate a pillow on the neo-classical stage.

Although the study of influences has been the major task of Comparative Literature in France, other topics equally open to precise delineation have not been neglected, for instance the rise and fall of *genres*. Here again there is no scope for comparison between a Pindaric ode and an ode by Victor Hugo, or between Greek and Shakespearian tragedy, but instead the historical connection is traced from Aeschylus via Seneca to the Elizabethan stage, and so on up to Ibsen and O'Neill: the stress is not so much upon the works themselves as upon the intermediaries, or upon the works as intermediaries. Favourite subjects were the spread of the Spanish *comedia* in Europe, or of French neo-classical drama in England and Germany. Paul van Tieghem in his book on Pre-Romanticism traced the impact of the pastoral idyll of Gessner all over Europe: similar was the spread of the Petrarchan sonnet, or the English Gothic novel. French Comparative Literature has also concerned itself with German *Stoffgeschichte* and the history of ideas—the evolution and transformation of symbolic figures like Cain, Satan, Electra, Antigone, Faust, Don Juan, Maria Stuart. Such studies merge at the concrete level into the history of myth and folklore, and at the abstract level into the history of philosophy—on the one hand Trousson's vast enquiry into *The Theme of Prometheus in European Literature* (1964), on the other the monumental studies of Paul Hazard: *The European Mind, 1680-1715*, and *European Thought in the 18th Century*. Another fascination of French Comparative Literature has been national psychology and the images that nations form of each other—the stereotyped perfidious Englishman or professorial German. F.C. Roe's *Taine and England* (1923) showed how a 'mythological' view of England influenced Taine's *History of English Literature*. Studies of wider scope include Georges Ascoli's *Great Britain in French Public Opinion of the 17th Century*, and Jean-Marie Carré's *The Image of Russia in French Intellectual Life 1839-1856*. Carré also investigated the French image of Germany—love giving way to hate after the 1870 war—in his *French Writers and the German Mirage 1800-1940*, while his student Guyard took up 'The Image

'Great Britain in the French Novel from 1914 to 1940.' Such studies, though no doubt comparative, can hardly be called literary, for they merely use literature as material for social history and insight into psychology.

Of recent years there has been a reaction in France against this traditional approach—a reaction spearheaded by the new Professor of Comparative Literature at the Sorbonne, René Etiemble, who replaced Carré. The limitations and contradictions of an excessively dogmatic approach produced what Etiemble called 'The Crisis of Comparative Literature' in the subtitle to his long essay *Comparaison n'est pas Raison* (1963). This essentially is a plea for widening the scope of Comparative Literature in France to include both the historical and the timeless 'aesthetic' approach. The defect of the strictly historical or sociological approach is that it leaves out of account or takes for granted the literary worth of what it is studying, and tends to get bogged down in trivia.<sup>10</sup> It leads to an undue emphasis on the second rate—the intermediaries, mediocre scholars and writers of reviews: the imitators of Goethe assume more importance than Goethe himself. A scholar may investigate Shakespeare in Serbia without ever having read Stendhal, let alone the living literature all around him. A teutomaniac like Charles de Villers is rescued from oblivion for his role in converting Mme. de Staël. All this is valid enough as background, but the comparatist tended to become as Etiemble called him an 'archivist' lost amidst catalogues and cross-references—work for which no sensibility was required at all. Yet of course sensibility cannot be left out of account, for the whole fascination of an influence is the way in which it has been transformed—lion is assimilated sheep. Nor could one ever hope to trace more than a fraction of the influences working upon an author—the lost conversations, lost letters, lost record of his reading. And even if we have access to his library, we can never be certain he read all the books there. Though Tolstoy, Dickens and Bankim are on the shelves of Saratchandra Chatterjee, our final assessment of the extent and quality of his indebtedness to those authors must rest on our literary response to their works and his. Hence Etiemble's insistence that his comparatist must be not only an encyclopaedist, but 'equally a man of taste and pleasure. I want all his preliminary studies to be for him only the means of reading the texts with more intelligence and consequently more joy, more *volupté*.' <sup>11</sup>

In the introduction to his book Etiemble had also attacked the parochialism of the traditional French school, concerned almost exclusively

with influences on France from outside or by French authors abroad (Guyard had fairly plausibly justified this as what they could do best). Instead, Etiemble would enlarge the scope of Comparative Literature to embrace all nations and all languages, and in his last chapter proposes some example subjects: the influence of French positivism in Latin America; contacts between Jews, Christians and Muslims in Andalusian Spain; Western influences on the literature of the Meiji; the role of the discovery of Japan in the formation of liberal ideas in the Age of Enlightenment; the evolution of racist ideas in Europe since the discovery of America and Black Africa; the impact of Hollywood films on French (or German, or English) literature; bilingualism in colonized countries; Taoism or Zen in Europe. . . .<sup>10</sup> And he would also include comparison where there is no contact, as between the Japanese *No* and European tragedy, the development of prose fiction in the Far East, India and Europe, or parallels with European pre-Romanticism in the Chinese poets of the pre-Sung era.<sup>11</sup> From this would arise a kind of comparative poetics, seeking the universals of literary form and expression. With this in mind Etiemble quotes with approval the dictum of G. Woodberry in the first issue of the *Columbia Journal of Comparative Literature*: 'The comparative method is the mother of all classicism'—we are back once again at the Renaissance. Another task is comparative stylistics, which in Etiemble's view 'should be the very basis of our studies.'<sup>12</sup> He would even extend the scope of Comparative Literature to include the export of vocabulary: the 16th century Italianization of French, gallicisms in Spanish, and the current fashion for English words in French (which Etiemble described in his essay: 'Parlez-Vous Franglais?'). Poor Carré must be groaning in his grave at this bursting of the flood-gates he had guarded all his life. All the old debates defining realism and romanticism to be revived, opinion to be once more mixed up with facts. Where is one to stop? Etiemble's comparatist must be not only a man of taste, historian and sociologist, with insight into music and the plastic arts, not only linguist, psychologist, anthropologist, and encyclopaedist, but even if possible a practitioner himself—novelist or poet, or at least with the impulse!<sup>13</sup> On top of that he must abandon the scholar's aloof indifference and become *engagé*, for as Etiemble sees it the choice of method has political as well as literary implications: 'Over an apparently technical quarrel, it seems to me the future of our humanism is being played out.'<sup>14</sup> The very style of Etiemble's writing—breathless and colloquial—is an affront to the staid reasoning of his predecessors.

But it would be wrong to underestimate the very real achievement of the French school. Works like Baldensperger's *Goethe in France* or Tiegheem's three-volume *Pre-Romanticism* are monumental achievements. To pursue the transformations of a theme or the spread of an influence is more fascinating than dull, however pedantic the spadework, and the discipline of facts preferable to the speculations of enthusiasm. We are not grateful to H. Dempsey, for instance, for revealing that Malteubriand found the arguments of his *Genie du Christianisme* in the English apologists at the time of his visit to England? or to Barbara Stulka for tracking down the source—a forgotten heroic novel—where Villos de Castro took the elements which transformed the legendary Cid into the courtly hero adopted by Corneille? Scholars like van Tieghem and Guyard were themselves aware of the dangers of pedantry or over-emphasis on the relatively insignificant or remote (like Racine in Bulgaria). If the works of a Paul Hazard or Baldensperger are far from dull. Furthermore, this sharp distinction between an arid 'French' and an over-enthusiastic 'American' school is unfair to the French, as Etiemble is the first to admit. After all, he was appointed to the chair at the Sorbonne, even before that the *Revue de Littérature Comparée* under the editorship of Georges Bataillon had opened its pages to all points of view, and from all countries. In the April-June issue of 1965 it had published an essay by H. Roddier entitled 'Principles for a Comparative History of European Literature' based on the archetypal structuralist methods of Jung, Eliade, and Levi-Strauss. In fact, in the many university towns of France, Comparative Literature was practised with considerable vitality. The latest general introduction to the subject, by Claude Mauriac and André-Rousseau, is very self-consciously international.<sup>15</sup> The authors even explain that if their book is written in French this has nothing to do with its point of view, nor even with the mother tongue of the authors (!), but is simply because the book is intended for distribution in French-speaking countries. Regional differences are respected—not merely French and American, but English, Italian, Japanese and the other European schools. All the same, the traditional French preference for the precise and determinable is evident in the authors' defence of 'influences' against René Wellek, and in the new structuralist approach which they elaborate in chapter V. This has affinities with Etiemble's comparative poetics, but runs the very risk of aridity that Etiemble had denounced in the 'archivist's' approach. Here, however, it is rather the illustration of dissection. The work of art is to be regarded as a com-

plex piece of clockwork (La Bruyère's image), which may be broken down into its parts. Using methods such as those of botany, 'one may compare works unconnected by any direct causality, but which possess a common structure or function.'<sup>16</sup> Thus the theme of the woman in love with her stepson will group together works quite outside the direct posterity of Euripides' Phaedra. Computer methods will assist these tasks: grammatical forms and rhythmical phrases, or repetitions of words will be plotted and set out on graphs to give us comparative indices, just as a counting of translations, imitations, and quotations may give us indices of an author's popularity. The ultimate aim would be to reduce all the elements of structure to objectively definable formulae, which could then be scientifically (i.e. quantitatively) compared. Only thus may the old rhetoric of personal impressions be avoided—for the task is to compare texts, not to compare our responses to texts. But the sections that follow, setting out the range of 'literary structuralism' are reassuringly descriptive (e.g. first person singular narrative contrasted with all-knowing narrator), and not so far removed from the old study of themes and genres.

One thing is clear: French Comparative Literature has abandoned the narrow path of historical connections, and set out to embrace also universal morphology, history of ideas, and international literary history. Here is the definition at which Pichois and Rousseau finally arrive:

Comparative Literature is the methodical art, by seeking ties of analogy, relationship or influence, of connecting literature with other realms of expression or knowledge, or connecting literary facts and texts between themselves (whether distant or not in time and space), provided that they belong to several languages or cultures even though of the same tradition, in order to describe, understand and appreciate them better.<sup>17</sup>

So after more than a century the name given by the early pioneers is vindicated: the aims are once more comparative and literary. Factually proved connections are relegated to the status of supporting evidence, and the new methods of structural analysis may bring some degree of scientific objectivity into the subjective realm of aesthetic response.

1. The following quotation from Voltaire's *Essay on Manners* will serve as a typical example of French 18th century comparatism: 'If one impartially (*sans préjugé*) weighs

Odyssey of Homer against the island of Ariosto, the latter wins in every respect, having the same defect—intemperance of the imagination and a romanesque facility. But Ariosto redeems this defect by such true allegories, such delicate touches, so profound a knowledge of the human heart, comic graces constantly following terrible passages, in short by such innumerable beauties of every kind, that he has discovered the secret of producing an admirable monster.

2. Conversation with Eckermann, 1827.

3. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th Feb. 1840.

4. Cl. Pichois and A.M. Rousseau: *La Littérature Comparée*.

5. Bordeaux, 1956: *General Literature and History of Ideas*.

6. 1957: *Flanders in the Romantic and Symbolist Movements*.

7. 1959: *France, Bourgogne and Switzerland in the 18th Century*.

8. 1960: *French Letters and Spain*.

9. 1962: *Commerce and Literature*.

10. 1963: *Learned Literature and Popular Literature—Poets*.

11. 1964.

12. 1965: *The Middle Ages*.

13. 1966: *Italianism in the 17th Century*.

14. Marius-François Guyard: *La Littérature Comparée* (No. 499), p. 7.

15. *Ibid.*, Preface, p. 6.

16. Or an excessive concern with definitions and the precise scope of the subject. P. van Tieghem, taking as axiomatic that comparison must be between different national literatures, enters upon an elaborate discussion whether writers who stay at home are to be distinguished from those who live abroad—e.g. the Swiss-born Rousseau and Belgian-born Verhaeren come into French literature because they lived in France, Trappier or Lemonnier do not because they stayed in Switzerland and Belgium though equally writing in French). So the influence of Zola on Lemonnier is legitimate in Narrative Literature, even though both write in French? And what about English romances on Burns? Or English authors on American authors? Or French authors on French-speaking Canadians? see P. van Tieghem: *La Littérature Comparée* (Armand Colin, 1951), pp. 57-9.

17. René Etiemble:

18. *Ibid.*, CIX), p. 84.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 105.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 70: Etiemble declares that he gave a course at Montclair on European romanticism in which all the illustrative quotations were 'taken from Chinese poets K'iu N Yuan, who lived before the Christian era, and the Sung period.'

21. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 89.

23. *Ibid.*, back cover.

24. Claude Pichois and André-M. Rousseau: *La Littérature Comparée* (Armand Colin, 1967, coll. U. 2). This replaces the earlier book by Paul van Tieghem (coll. Armand Colin, No. 144, 1951) originally published in 1931.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 142.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 174.

## CLASSICAL FORMS OF THE SIMILE

The object of this paper is to study two different techniques in the use of the literary image. Poetry is the language of images and its effectiveness depends greatly on the capacity of the poet to evoke, by means of well-chosen images, the hidden beauty of a scene or the emotional potential of a situation.

In the West, a long tradition going back to Homer has established a kind of pattern which classical writers follow without questioning. It is based on a conception of the literary image taken as an *analogy*. The parallelism between the image and the object it illustrates (between the *upamāna* and the *upameya*) need not be very strict or accurate in all the details. It is the general impression that counts and the poet may, at times, find the image itself so attractive that he develops it for its own sake. This relative independence of the image is more frequent in oral poetry than in written poetry. And the reason for it is not far to seek. In oral poetry, the bard may hit on an analogy which he finds both suitable and beautiful. But he has no time to study the potentialities contained in it, nor can he, in the flow of the narrative, check if all the details which occur to him are strictly relevant to the subject at hand. On the other hand, the poet who writes ornate poetry is fully conscious of the demands of his readers whose sensitive perception is focussed on the workmanship of the details as much as on the general movement of the poem. Hence the necessity of a subtler art and of a deliberate control over the spontaneous vivacity of imagination.

We may illustrate this difference between the image in oral and ornate poetry by quoting one instance in which Homer and Virgil use the same image in two different contexts. In *Iliad*, VI.506-511, Paris having been rescued from death has gone back to the palace and sought comfort at the side of Helen. Hector appears and chides him for his hesitation

go back to the battle-field.

41. Paris decides to obey:

Having put on his splendid armour, he hurried off through the town at full speed, like a stallion who breaks his halter at the manger where they keep him and fatten him, and gallops off across the fields in triumph to his usual bathing place in the delightful river. He tosses up his head; his mane flies back along his shoulders; he knows how beautiful he is; and away he goes skimming the ground with his feet, to the haunts and pastures of the mares.<sup>1</sup>

The image is certainly quite appropriate – most of the details like a vivid picture of the young and handsome Trojan. But the two stallions are hardly parallel. Paris is leaving the comforting presence of Helen and the cosy atmosphere of the palace to go back to the battle-field and once more face death which he has just escaped. The stallion, on the contrary, escapes from confinement and runs towards freedom and love.

In *Aeneid*, XI.490-497, Turnus, the young hero whose bride and kingdom are threatened, proudly rejects King Latinus' proposal to stop the war. While they are debating, the news comes that Aeneas is attacking. Immediately Turnus prepares himself for battle:

All golden he glittered as he hurried down from the citadel's height exultant in his high spirit and in his hope of finding his foe at hand; like some stallion which has broken his tether and, free at last, gallops from his stall with all the open plains before him, hastening towards the pastures where herds of mares are feeding, or perhaps goes to bathe once again in the water of some favourite river, and afterwards leaps ahead, lifts his neck, and neighs in delight, his mane dancing over withers and shoulders.<sup>2</sup>

There is no doubt that the image, under the pen of Virgil, has gained in poetic power. Turnus, much more than Paris, fits the beautiful image of the stallion. Homer, it would seem, stopped at the merely external details, while Virgil captured the spirit and gave us an insight into the heart of Turnus.

Yet, in both cases, the image remains an analogy. The image is not meant to provide, in all its details, a perfect parallel to the details of the object described. Neither Homer nor Virgil is allegorising. Theirs is the art of the impressionist painter, not that of the miniaturist. They aim at creating an impression, an atmosphere, and the difference between the two poets is one of degree only. Usually Virgil is more appropriate and his comparisons are more consciously chiselled and finished.



This point could be illustrated with many examples. The following will suffice. In *Odyssey*, VIII.523-530, Odysseus is the guest of King Alcinous. The minstrel Demodocus is singing the lays of the Fall of Troy. Moved by the vivid narrative,

Odysseus broke down and his cheeks were wet with the tears that ran down from his eyes. He wept as a woman weeps when she throws her arms round the body of her beloved husband, fallen in battle before his city and his comrades, fighting to save his home-town and his children from disaster. She has found him gasping in the throes of death; she clings to him and lifts her voice in lamentation. But the enemy come up and belabour her back and shoulders with spears, as they lead her off into slavery and a life of miserable toil, with her cheeks wasted by her pitiful grief. Equally pitiful were the tears that now welled up in Odysseus' eyes.<sup>3</sup>

The pathos of the scene is what the minstrel has in mind. But once the image of the disconsolate war-widow takes hold of his imagination, he half forgets about Odysseus. He cannot resist the desire to describe the whole scene. Thus he offers to his audience a picture of pathetic sorrow whose details bear little relevance to Odysseus' situation. The audience has no time to analyse the comparison. It is enough for them to feel that the emotions of Odysseus have been deeply stirred.

In *Aeneid*, I.142-154, Aeolus, the keeper of winds and storms, has been prevailed upon by Juno to unleash a hurricane against the fleet of Aeneas. But Neptune, the lord of the sea, has not been consulted. Sensing the turmoil above him, he emerges from the waves, rebukes the undisciplined winds and,

lightly skiing the wave-crests in his chariot, he calms the seas. It had been like a sudden riot in some great assembly, when, as they will, the meaner folk forget themselves and grow violent, so that firebrands and stones are soon flying, for savage passion quickly finds weapons. But then they may chance to see some man whose character and record command respect. If so, they will wait in silence, listening keenly. He will speak to them, calming their passions and guiding their energies. So now all the uproar of the ocean subsided.

The image is beautiful and appropriate and, like that of the stallion, it gives us a glimpse into the heart of the situation. Yet, like Homer, Virgil, too, is carried away by the comparison. He has witnessed Rome's troubled times. The riot scene with the sudden appearance of a respected dignitary and, perhaps, in undertone, the evocation of Augustus putting an end to the turmoil of the civil wars, is too tempting for him to leave it unfinished. It takes him twelve full verses to bring it to a close.

Both Homer and Virgil use the hexameter. They are not hampered by any kind of fixed stanza. They feel free to enlarge and their flowing sentences move leisurely, line after line, with the facility of an unobstructed stream. Virgil, as we have seen, is a more conscious artist than Homer. At times, his analogy almost borders on allegory. In *Aeneid*, 471-475, Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, in the gateway of Hades' palace:

He leaps forth, weapon in hand, sparkling in a sheen of bronze. He is like a snake which after winter spent hidden below ground, swollen from a fare of poisonous weeds, now emerges into light, and shedding its slough, shines with fresh youthfulness; tall and erect he stands in the sun; raising his breast he coils a slithering back and sets flickering a triple tongue.

Like the snake coming back to life, Pyrrhus appears as a new Achilles. He has been fed on the poisonous weeds of his father's memory. His menacing presence and the suppleness of his athletic body evoke the image of an aroused snake. Yet, Virgil's approach is more intuitive than deliberate. As an artist, he paints freely, according to his inspiration. In general, the details of the image are meant to have a cumulative effect rather than a precise and definite import.

He excels, through visual evocation, in creating the impression of disaster and of heart-rending melancholy. In *Aeneid*, 11.625-631, Aeneas witnesses the fall of the ancient city of Troy. It majestically pathetic:

It was now, visibly before my eyes, settling into the fires, uprooted the city was overturning; like an ancient rowan-tree high up among the mountains. Farmers lying all round to dislodge it hack it with the repeated strokes of their axes. It begins to tremble, threatening to fall, with its crest shaking and its high boughs awaying, until gradually vanquished it gives a final groan, and at last overcome by the wounds and wrenched from its place, it trails hither down the mountain-side.

Virgil more than Homer, is concerned with the deeper emotions of the human heart. He has a message to convey to the Romans of his time. He believes that the Roman empire under Caesar Augustus is destined to bring peace and happiness to the world. The story of Aeneas and of his many tribulations and sufferings, the example of his endurance and fidelity to the great mission given him by the gods are meant to be a reminder of those moral virtues which are at the foundation of greatness. It is that message which Virgil was to convey to the sophisticated Romans

of his time. His poetic talent is at the service of his message; that is why his epic narrative acquires a new dimension. His verbal magic and the music of his verses are the medium through which his pensive melancholy penetrates into our hearts. Battles and exploits he can depict with epic vividness, but behind it all, there is always present the anguish and the suffering which seem to be the necessary preparation for true greatness. Thus Virgil is not using his epic theme to display his literary skill, although he knows full well that, without literary skill, he will not touch the hearts of his readers. When, before dying, he expressed the desire to have his epic burned, it was because he felt that, as a poet, he had not done justice to the sublimity of the theme.

The greatest disciple of Virgil is Dante. In *Inferno*, 1.85-87, he greets Virgil as the master to whom he owes all the riches of his poetic talent:

Yet Dante was living at a time when allegory had captivated men's minds. Not only is the whole *Commedia* a vast allegory, but even Dante's individual similes tend to assume the pattern of allegory in the choice and economy of their descriptive traits. Unlike Virgil, Dante writes in stanzas. Of course, the *terza rima* admits of overlapping: it is a kind of intermediary between the freedom of the single line and the strict structure of the fixed stanza. Dante, however, usually keeps to his ternary scheme, although he often brings two or three stanzas together. His comparisons are much more numerous and varied than Virgil's. The wealth of his imagination is inexhaustible: science, art, astronomy, nature, scenes of daily life, history, mythology provide him with vivid images which, beyond their purely descriptive power, throb with a hidden sensitivity.

In *Purgatorio*, II, Dante meets his friend Casella the musician. He asks him to sing one of those love-songs "che mi solea quetar tutte mie voglie" ("which once could charm all fevers out of me"). Casella begins to sing and Dante, Virgil and the company of souls stand, entranced

forgetful of all the rest. Suddenly stern Cato appears,  
and breaks the spell:

as when pigeons picking corn or tares, all assembled at their repast, are so  
absorbed as to forget their wonted vanity; but if something appears to frighten  
their hearts, at once they leave their food, driven away by greater care, so did  
I see that new company leave the son. (II.124-131)

could match each detail of the simile with  
one:

Cato's sudden appearance  
the new company leaves the song  
reminded that they have to  
purify themselves

the second terrace of Purgatory, Dante is besieged by a throng  
of repentant sinners who beg him to pray for their speedy release. He  
finds it very difficult to shake them off. To describe the scene, Dante  
uses the simile of the successful gambler:

When the game of dice is up, the loser back sorrowing, re-playing each  
throw and brooding sadly. But with the winner the whole crowd hurries away:  
one goes in front, another pulls him from behind, another, at his side prays to  
be remembered. But he does not stop, attending to one and then to another.  
Those to whom he extends his hand cease to press, and so he saves him from  
the crowd. Such was I in that milling crowd, turning my face this side and  
that, and I got rid of them by promises. (VI.1-12)

Dante is the successful gambler. But, by mentioning the loser, and his  
brooding, he remembers that he could still be in the dark wood where  
the right path appeared nowhere, were it not for the providential inter-  
vention of Beatrice. And it is with a deep sense of gratitude that he  
sympathises with those who beg his help.

In spite of differences in workmanship between Homer, Virgil and Dante,  
the Western classical tradition possesses one common characteristic: the

image and the scene it illustrates are juxtaposed. The fusion between the two is accomplished in the mind of the reader. The method of juxtaposition implies an almost independent treatment of the image, with the consequence that it may be elaborated even beyond the requirements of the comparison. The extended simile reveals a desire to be explicit, to be depicted at length. Eric Auerbach, speaking of Homer, notes "the need of the Homeric style to leave nothing which it mentions half in darkness and unexternalized."<sup>5</sup> This applies, in varying degrees, to Virgil and Dante as well. In Sanskrit terms, one would speak of a predilection for *abhidhā*. This, of course, does not mean that the Western classical simile is deprived of evocatory power. But its evocatory power derives, not from what is left unsaid, but from the general impression created by the rich and vivid image whose abundant details fuse into one vision.

When we pass from the Western tradition to the classical Indian tradition, we enter a different world. The greatest representative of that tradition is Kālidāsa. He lived in the Gupta period, a period of high artistic achievement and of refined sophistication. More than the Roman *literati* of Virgil's time, the cultured Indians of Kālidāsa's time were conscious of their right to demand a high standard of poetic skill. Both the Sanskrit language and the standards set by the theoreticians of literature impose on the poet a much greater weight of responsibility than the Latin poet ever had to sustain. Everybody knows Kālidāsa's aphorism: "a paritoṣād vidūṣaṃ na sādhu manye prayogavijnānam" ("I think knowledge of how to put on a play does not achieve success until the learned are pleased"<sup>6</sup>).

Like Virgil, Kālidāsa has a great message to transmit in his *Raghuvamśa*. But it is not a new message. From the point of view of the moral import of poetry, Kālidāsa is much closer to Vālmīki than Virgil is to Homer. Kālidāsa hardly innovates when he extols the great virtues of truthfulness, detachment and purity. His Rāma, as an epic figure, is not substantially different from Vālmīki's. Whether his *Raghuvamśa* is a glorification of the Gupta dynasty or not, is, in fact, secondary. His ideals are not confined to one period: they are an integral part of a long tradition. It is, therefore, the novelty of their poetic expression which is the central concern of Kālidāsa.

Kālidāsa's poetic genius is extraordinary: it consists in veiling under a seeming simplicity and charming facility the subtle and elaborate workmanship of an artist who scrutinizes every detail and leaves nothing to

change. To this workmanship the Sanskrit language offers ample scope. More than Latin, it possesses stylistic potentialities which lesser poets than Kālidāsa can exploit to display a virtuosity which hides their emptiness. The figures of speech, both of sound and sense, have been studied to the point of becoming the object of a refined technique. The extreme concision which the *samāsa* and other grammatical devices can achieve, the *śleṣa*, the extreme suppleness of verbal forms, all lend to the language a singular power. Kālidāsa fully dominates that power and is never the slave of his technique.

To this must be added the fact that Sanskrit poetry is written in stanzas. The metres usually have four equal *padas* and each stanza constitutes a poetic unit with its own individuality. The extended simile of Homer and Virgil was made possible by the absence of the limitation of the stanza. What Kālidāsa would have done with the freedom which Virgil enjoyed, we do not know. But we know that the brevity and brevity of the stanza have not hampered his genius. His images are like miniatures worked out in their minutest details and polished like jewels. Rarely is he satisfied with mere analogy. His simile often borders on the metaphor and the music of his verse is consummate.

Our first acquaintance with Kālidāsa the artist should begin with a stanza which has a certain amplitude; he will thus remain close enough to Virgil as far as verbal scope is concerned. In *Sakuntalā*, King Duṣyanta tries to explain to his jester the charm of the hermit-girl's unspoilt beauty. He has discovered a unique treasure: the faded beauty of the harem of his harem leaves him indifferent now that he has seen the freshness of Kaṇva's daughter:

We have here the picture of the quintessence of delight, a sensuous beauty which leaves no sense unsatisfied, a coveted reward for a life of unbroken toil. Every detail, every adjective or participle is perfectly chosen.

Her beauty is there for everybody to see, but to enjoy it, to be the *bhokta*, is a favour which must be conferred by the Creator.

A fruitful comparison may be established between the beginning of the *Aeneid* and that of the *Raghuvamśa*. Virgil first speaks of the theme which he is called upon to develop: "Arma virumque cano . . ." (1.1), then invokes the Muse for help: "Musa, mi i causas memora . . ." (1.8) and then begins his narrative. Kālidāsa's first stanza is an invocation to Śiva and Pārvatī, the parents of the universe, whose perfect union is a symbol of that perfect blending of sound and sense which is the very stuff of poetry. It is his ideal as a poet which comes first:

vāgarthāviva samṛktau vāgarthapratipattaye  
jagataḥ pitarau vande pārvatiparamesvar. (1.1)

The very inadequacy of his power in the face of the glory of the great dynasty provides him with an opportunity to display his wonderful skill. Within the limits of the 32 syllables allowed by the *anuṣṭubh*, three times his images flash in rapid succession. First the madness of the attempt:

kva *sūryaprabhavo* vaṁśaḥ kva *cālpavisūyā* mati

ith the two adjectives suggesting the distance between his theme and is talent. Then the image:

titirṣur dustaram mohād uḍupenāsmi sāgaram (1.2b)

( y folly makes me dream of crossing the shoreless ocean on a raft.)

Then the ridiculous greed for a poet's fame:

mandaḥ kaviyaśaḥ prārthi

Fortunately, great poets before him—and he thinks chiefly of Vālmīki—have opened the way before him with their wonderful songs:

"am": that is what I am, a greedy fool whose path has fortunately prepared by great poets, an ordinary thread compared to diamond. As such, "Raghū ām anvayam vakṣye": "I will celebrate the glory of the Raghus," like Virgil who said: "Arma virumque cano." Virgil, too, who in a majestic sentence sketches the chequered career of a hero, Kālidāsa, breaking for once the strict unity of the stanza contrates the glory of the royal dynasty with the full and solemn flow of an uninterrupted series of sixteen genitive plurals rhythmically hunting each *pāda* of four stanzas (1.5-8) and coming to a harmonious end in the "Raghunām" which begins verse 9.

There is a definite affinity between the two poets: both realize the altitude of their enterprise and the sublimity of their theme. But their outlook differs: Virgil, fully conscious of his poetic talent, puts it in service of the message to be conveyed, whereas Kālidāsa, fully aware of the poetic potentialities of the traditional legend, decides to use it as the canvas on which he will embroider the delicate patterns dictated by his poetic genius.

It is impossible to give a full analysis of Kālidāsa's imagery. Similes and metaphors seem to flow from his pen with such ease that one really feels that the simile is his normal and most spontaneous medium of expression.

Here is a stanza written in *triṣṭubh* (four *pādas* of 11 syllables each). In returning from the *svayamvara* with beautiful Indumati. The only suitors to whom he has been preferred are waiting in ambush and a terrible combat ensues. The battle-field is described and Kālidāsa uses all the resources of his imagination and of the Sanskrit language. He achieves a perfect compactness which are astounding:

It would not be difficult to imagine that at Virgil would have done this image. After describing the raging battle, he would have said: "It was just like the drinking house of death." Then a new and fully developed description of the drinking house of death would have followed, and all the vivid details he could imagine. Here is an example of his



technique. The Trojans have landed on the Italian soil. They are fighting under the walls of King Latinus' city, pushing forward with great vigour, and being repulsed again and again.

They moved like the ocean when it advances by flow and ebb, now surging landwards, flinging its waves high upon the cliffs with bursts of spray and drenching the furthest edge of the sand with enveloping flood, and now suddenly in swift retreat, rolling boulders with it in the suction of its backwash, till the water grows shallow and slides away, leaving the shore dry. (*Aeneid*, XI.624-628)

Kālidāsa's technique is definitely different. In 44 syllables, without any duplication of adjectives, he chooses three graphic details: the fruits, the cups, the wine, and, in one single description, he evokes a double vision. Virgil presents us with a diptych which we must visualize as one image. Kālidāsa gives us a transparency through which, at a deeper level, we perceive the evocation of another scene. Both excel in their art, each using to the full the potentialities of his language and his metre.

Now, almost at random, we choose a few more illustrations of Kālidāsa's art and technique. Indumatī is going round the palace hall, stopping briefly before each suitor and then passing on:

sañcārī i dipaśikheva rātrau yam yam vyatīyāya patimvarā sā  
narendramārgāṭṭa iva prapade vivarṇabhāvam sa sa bhūmipālāḥ (

(Like the flame of a lamp moving in the night, the princess in quest of a husband passed in front of each suitor and [as she passed] each prince, like a tower on the royal road, faded into darkness [or became deadly pale].)

The moving light bringing a momentary glow on the towers and then relegating them to darkness delicately suggests the expectation, the short-lived hope and the final despondency of the suitors.

To the extended simile, Kālidāsa prefers a succession of di images, each of them adding a new trait to the suggested picture. One of the finest examples of this technique is the stanza quoted above and describing the unspoilt beauty of Śakuntalā. Here is another, written in *vāsantatilakā* (four *pādas* of 14 syllables each) describing the welcome given to Sītā by Bharata, on her return from Lankā:

(the moon is saved from gathering clouds by the end of the rains, so the daughter of Janaka was saved from the torments of the ten-headed demon by her steadfast, she was greeted by Bharata.)

Here the two images are explicitly developed, they keep their with the *upameya* through the use of a single participle "*pratya-*" applying to Sītā, to the earth and to the glow of the moon. Specially, the last king of the Rāghavas, Agnivarṇa, whose self-indulgence the glorious dynasty to an inglorious end is slowly consumed

paścimakālāsthītendu  
lat kulam abhūt kṣaṇikam

the sky when the moon reaches its last digit or like a pond which summer reduced to a tract of mud, that great dynasty, in that king wasted by consumption, became like a lamp whose flame is dwindling :

Evocation of these three images with their connotation of salvation and approaching darkness is very effective.

Western classical image beautiful decoration enhancing the of a scene or of an emotion by a parallel analogy meant to a general impression. The juxtaposed image need not be accurate details and may, at times, be developed for its own sake. Its is to provide a visual or emotional echo orchestrating the theme. In other terms, we could say that the image is a variation on the main

the classical image of India, the parallelism between *upamāna* and *upameya* is usually minute and faithfully observed. The technique implies a certain amount of preciousity. In Kālidāsa, preciousity is brilliancy; it is rather a refinement of imagination by which the abandoning the path of the obvious, establishes with reality relations more subtle than those which the Western tradition has cultivated. If, the technique is not one of juxtaposition, but rather of coincidence. In other terms, we could speak of a blending of

Western classicism likes to unfold its riches and expose in the full light of elaborate poetic diction. Indian classicism

prefers superimposing various levels of imaginative vision, thus allowing their hidden correspondences to create a kind of verbal and visual harmony in which *upamāna* and *upameya* lose, as it were, their separate identity by being fused into the unity of the image.

1. Trans. E.V. Rieu.
2. This and all subsequent translations are mine.
3. Trans. E.V. Rieu.
4. This and the following quotation from the *Commedia* Sayers's Translation. The two subsequent translations are mine.
5. "Odysseus' Scar", *Mimesis*, trans. Willard Trask.
6. Trans. M.B. Emeneau.. All subsequent translations from 'āli

# THE

to me that nobody interested in literature can fail to respond to the Upaniṣads, whatever be his religious or philosophical views.

Ideally the best translator of great literature would be an artist as well as a scholar. Failing this, and even were the combination to exist, still many different approaches are useful: a traditional approach, a philosophical approach, an academic approach, a historical approach, even a literary approach and finally a purely literary approach. For the Upaniṣads such works exist.

Many of the translations by Indian and Western scholars are traditional in that they use and interpret according to Śaṅkara's commentaries. For instance, the early (1856) translation of the *Āraṇyaka* by Roer, or the 1934 translation by Swami Madhavananda of the same text along with the commentary of Śaṅkara. R. E. H. The *13 Principal Upaniṣads* published in 1921 is a fine example of a readable literal translation. Emile Senart's edition and translation of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* in the 1920's is a model of careful clear scholarship.

And of course the German translation of 1897 by Deussen, *Die Upaniṣad's des Veda*, has been the basis of many later translations.

The historical approach is seen in the essays by Keith in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain* and in his two volumes *History and Philosophy of the Vedas*. Recently (1954) we have the Radhakrishnan translation, on the whole popular. But the literary approach is needed, exclusively to my knowledge, by *The Ten Principal Upaniṣads* put into English by Shree Purohit Swami and W. B. Yeats and published in 1937. If we did not have this translation, and were it known that among Yeats's posthumous papers a translation of the Upaniṣads had been found our enthusiasm could hardly be contained. All Yeats is in the opinion of a good number of critics one of the great of modern poets in English. Moreover we know that a certain

amount of Eastern and particularly Indian mysticism influenced to some extent much of his poetry, certainly his thinking. Therefore his translation of these texts would promise much. But we do have the translation and unfortunately our enthusiasm has managed to control itself very well indeed. The publication, with minor exceptions, was not met with great rejoicing. It was considered neither a literary feat nor a feat of translation. In fact, some reviewers went so far, and I would very reluctantly be among them, as to consider the translation to have generally failed.

It saddens me to say this, for I am aware of how great a work of art Yeats could have produced. I wish that I were able to criticise with diffidence, but the very clarity of the translation forces me to realise its patent faults. I am not vague about its value, and if any light mist seems to hover mysteriously over the rest of this paper, it is only because I am deeply puzzled by the circumstances that led Yeats to failure in this work.

Yeats said in his introduction that he wanted "to make a translation that would read as though the original had been written in common English" and in many places with fine phrasing he achieves this: "They have put a golden stopper into the neck of the bottle. Pull it Lord! Let out reality. I am full of longing." Or on p. 83: "Sage Vāmadeva said: 'When lying in the womb, I understood how the gods worked. They put me into that iron-gated, hundred-gated, prison; but I fled quickly; I fled like a hawk.' Sage Vāmadeva broke out of the body. . . ." But in general I find the language unexceptional, and certain phrases, such as "life merge into the all prevalent" (p. 17) could hardly be taken for common English. But to substantiate what I have said, which in an important sense judges the work beyond Yeats, let me briefly examine certain passages which I have chosen more or less at random.

Here is Yeats's translation of one of the  
in the Upaniṣads: the last chapter of the *Taittirīya*:

He who lives in man, he who lives in the sun, are the same. He who knows this, says goodbye to the world; goes beyond elemental Self, living Self, thinking Self, knowing Self, joyous Self. He moves at will throughout the world, enjoying whatever he will, creating whatever shape he will, praising the unity of Spirit—miraculous, miraculous, miraculous.

I am the food, I am the food, I am the food; I am the eater, I am the eater, I am the eater; I am the link between, I am the link between, I am the link between.

Here is the Sanskrit: Sa yāścāyam puruṣe / yāścāsavāditye / sa ekah / sa ya  
 evaṇvit / asmāḷlokāṭpretya / etannannamayam ātmānam upasaṅkrāmya / etaṅ  
 prāṇamayam ātmānam upasaṅkrāmya / etaṅ manomāyān ātmānam upasaṅ  
 krāmya / etaṅ vijñānamāyān ātmānam upasaṅkrāmya / etaṅ anandamayān  
 ātmānam upasaṅkrāmya / imāḷmlokān kāmānānī kāmārupyanusaṃcaran  
 etatsāma gāyannāste / haaaa vu haaaa vu haaaa vu aham annam aham  
 annam aham annam / aham annādoooo aham annādoooo aham annādah  
 aham ślokaḥ aham ślokaḥ aham ślokaḥ /

This passage is often chanted today. any of you will have heard  
 are aware of its musical beauty. Here is an attempt at a transla-  
 ti

That which is in man and that which is in the sun, is the same.  
 Whoever knows this, leaves the world behind him. He glides past  
 the self made of food, glides past the self made of life, glides pas  
 the self made of mind, glides past the self made of consciousness,  
 glides past the self made of joy, devouring pleasures, changing his  
 form at will he sits singing this song:

Oh the wonder,  
 The wonder,  
 The wonder of it.

I am food, I am food, I am food ! Oh, oh, oh I eat food ! I am  
 the creator of poetry. I am the creator of poetry, I am the creator  
 of poetry!

Of course this translation also fails, but then I am not a poet. In  
 Sanskrit the passage beginning "etannannamayam ātmānam upasaṅ-  
 krāmya" is repeated in five variations in ascending pitch and is climaxed  
 he "Haaaa vu haaaa vu haaaa vu." There is an indication in the text  
 these syllables (which the commenator explains as sharpening the  
 of extraordinary joy and wonder) are to be prolonged to thrice the  
 pronunciation. The same prolongation is required after "I am the  
 of food." In Yeats's translation there is no attempt to reproduce  
 thing similar in English and in fact the ascending sequence of "he glides  
 the self made of food" is weakened by abbreviation. Yeats's "prai-  
 the Unity of Spirit" for the ori inal "sits singing this song" is to  
 ly poetry for religion. The original, and Yeats's translation bear  
 relationship to one another. Not only is the translation wrong,  
 it misleads the reader, for what follows is the song he sings which  
 could not know from Yeats's translation.

Before examining the next passage, Bṛhadāraṇyaka IV, iii, 22 it is necessary to note that the numbering given in the translation is not only useless for locating passages, but also erroneous. The above passage is given by Yeats as belonging to book VII whereas in fact there is no such book. The same is true of all the numberings given. Here is Yeats translating a passage dealing with the state of utter tranquillity:

Father disappears, mother disappears, world disappears, gods disappear, Vedas disappear, thief disappears, rogue disappears, ascetic disappears, monk disappears, menial disappears, good and evil disappear; he has gone beyond sorrow.

The word rogue is meant to translate the Sanskrit *bhrūṇaḥ*, literally embryo-killer and thus "murderer" would have been more appropriate. Rogue is a weak word in any case. But more important is the lumping together of the two Sanskrit terms "*caṇḍāla*" and "*paulkasa*" as "menial". A "*caṇḍāla*" is, as all the commentaries explain, a person born of a Brahmin woman and a śūdra man. A Paulkasa is someone born of a Kṣatriya woman with a śūdra man. Again, "menial" is a weak word with almost no associations behind it. The force of the original is lost. It is not, and this is important, that Yeats has sacrificed accuracy for the sake of poetry, for one could hardly call this passage successful poetry.

My point is that opening the book at random nearly every passage is inaccurate, and what is more important, the inaccuracies are never on the side of poetry. In fact, the contrary is true. For example here are the last three passages from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. Yeats:

Attain the aim of my life, I enter the Kingdom of Heaven, where there is nothing more to attain: I enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

The Sanskrit translates literally

I have done what is to be done, and I am  
world of Brakma, yes, born into it.

"Kingdom of Heaven" is an unfair Christian notion.  
the text. Next Yeats translates:

Grant that I may enter the audience chamber. Grant that I  
may become glory itself; the glory of saints, the glory of kings,  
the glory of merchants; grant that I attain the glory of all glories.  
Grant that I may never be born again.

the literal translation from the original Sans

am granted entrance to the learned assembly of Prajāpati.  
become splendid. The splendour of Brāhmins, the splendour  
f kings, the splendour of the citizens, I have it all. Oh, I am the  
splendour that is in splendour itself. May I never attain that  
rite and toothless, yes that toothless white drivelling (old age).

at wherever the text is most rich in associations and in poetry.  
implies. In the last passage Yeats translates the Sanskrit  
sa sarvabhūtaṇi anyatra tirthebhyaḥ" as "he never asks anything  
he unless upon pilgrimage." Of course the original, as you will  
he imply "he practices harmlessness to all beings except at places  
mage." Now we may not like this exception, but it is no reason  
the translation to mean something utterly different. After all,  
something of someone is not the same thing as to take their life.  
he "Who knows this, knows" which is how Yeats ends his transla-  
the *Taittirīya*, the same "suvarṇajyotiḥ ya evam veda  
the "He who knows this becomes golden light."

am convinced that no scholarly trivia is at stake here. It may  
it way from the errors of taste and judgment that I have been  
out. But consider the following: it is not impossible to feel  
original text of the Upaniṣads in Sanskrit is a translation of  
English version. An improved, literary translation. By poets  
I with the advantages of modern sensitivity that allow them to  
hall additions to a verse like: "As a large fish moves from one  
a river to the other, Self moves between waking and dreaming"  
g that the fish is a great fish and that he glides easily from bank  
first the Eastern bank, then the Western bank.

he whines my feeling that Yeats was one of the great poets of this  
one must be as puzzled by his translations as I am. And trou-  
peaching for a solution, or rather an explanation, I thought of the  
where Yeats has turned "caṇḍāla" into "menial" and I remem-  
ber the well known passage of the *Chāndogya* (IV.iv.1) dealing  
he. Curious to see how Yeats handled this I searched for it in the  
he. It wasn't there. I thought this very odd, because the passage  
really very famous. It is about a young boy who approaches  
he and asks for information concerning his *gotra*, for he wishes  
he a student. His mother very quietly tells him that in her youth  
he child and wandered from place to place. At this time he was



born. So she does not know his *gotra*. With the same impressive honesty the child approaches a learned teacher and in reply to the question of what *gotra* he is, repeats his mother's words. The teacher responds in kind and with tongue in cheek tells him that he knows him to be a Brahmin, for only a Brahmin would be so honest. It is a lovely passage, and I was dismayed by the fact that Yeats did not translate it.

I began thinking of those passages in the Upaniṣads which had struck me when I first read them as being remarkable poetry. For instance there is the mysteriously beautiful story of Janaśrūti (*Chāndogya* IV, i, 1) who wakes up in the dead of night to hear two wild geese passing overhead and praising a man called Raikva, Raikva of the cart. Intrigued and strangely troubled, he sends out men to search for him and finally they discover a leprous beggar scratching his body beneath a cart. Janaśrūti approaches him in regal splendour and offers him six hundred cows, and a gold necklace and a chariot drawn by a she-mule, in order to hear his teaching. But Raikva calls him a Śūdra and sends him away. When he comes back again he brings more gifts, among them his own daughter. When he speaks to Raikva he adds that he may keep as his own the village in which he is sitting. But Raikva still calls him a Śūdra, then, with the tip of his fingers he lifts up the face of the girl, and astonished, he tells the King that this alone would have caused him to speak. It is a truly haunting story, and yet Yeats has not translated it.

The one line about lifting up the girl's face is a poem in itself. How could Yeats, I thought, fail to be excited? Another passage Yeats omitted is the famous "Da da da" passage of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, V, ii, 1. Prajāpati's three sons, the gods, men and the demons, ask their father for instruction. He says only one syllable, *da*, to each of them. The gods understood that they were being asked to restrain themselves. Men understood that they were to be generous. And the demons felt it meant to be compassionate. *Damyata, datta, dayadhvam*. And Prajāpati said that each had understood correctly. I find this omission remarkable, since it was considered of sufficient merit to have been included, as you all know, in Eliot's *Waste Land*. Furthermore in the commentary by Śaṅkara on this passage is a phrase that surely Yeats would have responded to. Śaṅkara is explaining why all three of these instructions must be carried out, though only one was meant for men. He says: "atha vā na devo asura vā 'nye kecana vidyante manuṣyebhaḥ" — "there are no gods or demons other than men."

Another passage from the *ghadāranyaka* (VI, iv, 20) that must have held Yeats' imagination is the beautiful verse, where the poet is saying to the woman he is making love to: "You are the sky and I the sky. Many foolish people have refused to translate these and the passages which follow. How unusual that Yeats should have omitted them.

Going over all the omissions, I discovered that more than three-quarters of the *Bṛhadāranyaka* had not been translated. And these passages, as I hope my brief quotations have showed, the least poetic part in the text. The entire *S'vetāśvatara Upaniṣad* was omitted in translation. A question of choice, you may answer. But these splendid lines on pantheism:

You are the dark-blue bird and the green parrot with red eyes. Lightning is your child. You are the seasons and the sea. (IV.6)

Remember the lovely parable of the two birds on the same branch of a tree which follows the passage I have quoted. Is it really that Yeats, with all his poetic feeling, would have failed to be moved by such passages? I think not. The evidence of the passages I have quoted inclines me to believe that Yeats relied heavily for his information on Purohit Swami. And Purohit quite obviously was supplying the quantity nor the quality of information required. I suggest that in the passages where we have seen the translation deliberately omit the poetry of the original, Yeats was either misinformed or else ignorant of the original Sanskrit. Further, I submit that he did not even know the existence of at least some of the passages omitted from his translation.

Admittedly, the charge against Purohit Swami is a heavy one: he is ignorant on grounds of taste, on grounds of accuracy, and what is more, on grounds of care. Surely the innumerable errors point to ignorance on the part of the person who knew the original? At least the unpleasant inference concerning Purohit Swami is that he was a man who did not take literature seriously, and it seems to me highly probable that he was ignorant of the genius of his over-trusting student. In a sobering but frightening thought that if Yeats had possessed a library, equipped with all the sources in languages he knew on the subject, he might have produced one of the great translations of Indian history. Certainly he had the capacity and the interest. I cannot doubt, but I doubt whether Yeats knew any of the important transla-

tions or even secondary works on the Upaniṣads available at the time of his translation work. Their number is considerable. A list of the various translations and studies on the Upaniṣads would fill a fair sized book. Many of these would have provided Yeats with the kind of information he obviously required but failed to find.

It is well known that Yeats was prone to placing a certain naive trust in those who claimed to be spokesmen for the East. I am afraid that the Yeats-Purohit Swami translation tells us that this is what must have happened, and literature is the poorer for it.

## পাশ সংকৃত রূপবর্ণনারীতির প্রভাব

১০০০ বর্ষ হ'লে—উপমা, উপস্থাপনা, 'অলঙ্কারের  
 ১০০০ বিষয়কৃতিতে সৌন্দর্য্য বৃদ্ধি  
 ১০০০ বর্ণনা। শুধু বিচিত্র 'অপেক্ষা পাঠ না,  
 ১০০০ সম্বন্ধে তেমনি 'অপেক্ষালিকে বিশ্ব-সৌন্দর্য্যের  
 ১০০০ পুস্তককে পি 'ফলে সৌন্দর্য্য-স্বাত 'অপেক্ষা 'বের কলাসম্বন্ধ,  
 ১০০০ বর্ণনা 'কেটি পূর্ণ 'সম্বন্ধ 'মাতৃস্বাক 'মিলিল সৌন্দর্য্যের  
 ১০০০ পুস্তক 'নির্দেশ 'ব'লে রূপবর্ণনার প্রতি কা 'কা পাঠকের,  
 ১০০০ উৎসাহ 'কাগে 'কপালকুণ্ডলা' উপস্থাপনা 'সংকৃত রূপবর্ণনার  
 ১০০০ 'ফলেও কবির স্বভাব-স্বলভ 'পরিমিতবোধও 'কুটে উঠেছে যার ফলে  
 ১০০০ 'সংকৃত এবং 'স্বন্দর।  
 ১০০০ 'কপালকুণ্ডলার রূপবর্ণনা 'বিশ্লেষণ করা যাক 'কুট একটী  
 ১০০০ 'একটিকে মীল উদ্দেশ্য 'সমুদ্র, 'অপেক্ষালিকে 'অপেক্ষার 'স্বামিনী: 'মাতৃস্বাক  
 ১০০০ 'নির্জনতার উপর 'তিমিরের 'অতন-বহন, 'কাড়িয়ে  
 ১০০০ 'মাদলাঘিতকুশল: 'কপালকুণ্ডলা। 'এই 'বিশেষ 'কবিতাটি 'মাতৃস্বাক 'কবি-  
 ১০০০ 'কপালকুণ্ডলার পূর্ণতা 'এনে 'দিয়ে 'পারত না। 'এককাল 'মিলিয়ে 'কপাল-  
 ১০০০ 'সম্বন্ধ। 'বহিঃস্বাক 'আমাদের 'মনে 'করিয়ে 'পবিত্রতার 'স্বামিনী  
 ১০০০ 'কি 'কিছু, 'উভয়েই 'যে 'দী 'বিকসিত 'হটতেছিল, 'সেই 'গভীরমাদী  
 ১০০০ 'কপালকুণ্ডলার 'না 'দেখিলে 'স্বাহার 'মোহিনী 'শক্তি 'অতৃপ্ত হই 'না।"  
 ১০০০ 'কপালকুণ্ডলার 'অতৃপ্ত 'রক্তিকে 'কুটিয়ে 'তোলবার 'কুট 'কুটি 'বিভাবের 'প্রয়োজন  
 ১০০০ 'আলম্বন 'বিভাব ও 'উদ্ভাবন 'বিভাব। 'উদ্ভাবন 'বিভাব 'দ্বারা 'আলম্বনগত  
 ১০০০ 'করতে 'পারে না। 'বহিঃস্বাক 'এই 'পরিবেশটি 'সম্পূর্ণ 'উদ্ভাবন 'বিভাবের

লৈলীতে নিমিত্ত এবং অতীত রসের স্বাদীভাব যে বিষয়, সেই বিষয় এখানে রত্নির পরবর্তীতে অবতীর্ণ হয়েছে। নবকুমারের দৃষ্টিতে “চমকিত লোকের দৃষ্টির ভ্রাস” বলা হয়েছে, যে-দৃষ্টি নিয়ে নবকুমার “অকস্মাৎ এইরূপ ভ্রগমধ্যে দৈবী মূর্তি দেখিয়া নিঃশব্দশব্দীর হঠাৎ ঠাড়াটলেন। তাঁহার বাক্য শক্তি রহিত হইল;—শব্দ হইয়া চাহিয়া রহিলেন।”

এখানে সংস্কৃত কবিদের সঙ্গে বঙ্কিমের যেমন সাদৃশ্য, তেমনি পার্থক্য। সাদৃশ্য এই যে, তিনি সংস্কৃতরীতির অঙ্গগত হ’য়ে পরিবেশটিকে উদ্দীপন বিভাবভাবে অঙ্কিত করেছেন। সংস্কৃত কবিরা মুখ্যত শৃঙ্গারপন্থী বলে তাঁদের পরিবেশের অনেকটা অংশই শৃঙ্গার-উপযোগী রতিভাবের উদ্দীপনবিভাব। বিশ্বম্ভর্য্যবাবের উদ্দীপনবিভাব অঙ্কিত করার বঙ্কিম সংস্কৃত কবিদের থেকে একটু স’রে দাঁড়িয়েছেন। সংস্কৃতেও, মুখ্যত ভবকৃতি ও বাণভট্টে, শৃঙ্গার বাতিরিক্ত উদ্দীপনবিভাব রচনার পরিচয় আছে।

লক্ষ্য করা যাবে যে বঙ্কিম ‘কপালকুণ্ডলার কেশভার, দেহরত্ন, মুখমণ্ডল, কটাকমর লোচন, শরঙ্গদেশ, বাহুযুগল, নিরাত্তর্য্য দেহের বর্ণ এবং সকলের সম্বন্ধীয়ভাবে মূর্তির মোহিনী শক্তি বর্ণনার ক্ষেত্রে বেছে নিয়েছেন। এ-রীতি সংস্কৃতের।

## ২. কুস্থল

কপালকুণ্ডলার কেশভার “অবেগীসংবদ্ধ, সংসদিত, রাশীকৃত, আগুলকলম্বিত”। সংস্কৃত কাব্যের বিরহিনীরা খোলাচুলেই থাকতেন, তবে খেঁগটা একটা গিট দিয়েও বাঁধতেন কেউ। খোলা এলোচুলে ‘মেঘদূতে’র যক্ষপত্নীর মুখ দেখা যায় না—“হতজ্ঞঃ মুখমলকলবাক্তি-লম্বালকখাং”। ‘মেঘদূতে’র পথিকবনিতারা “উদগৃহীতালকখাঃ”। ‘রঘুবংশে’ ১৬শ সর্গে কানিনীগণের “স্নানাপ্রমুক্তেবস্ত্রধূপবাসম্”। ‘কাদম্বরী’তে মহাশেতার আল্লাম্বিত কুস্থল কপালের শুক চন্দনের ধূলায় ধূসর হয়েছে “তেনৈব মূর্ছানিহিতেন কিকিণাক্তান-চন্দন-ললাটিকা-লগ্ন-ধূসরাঙ্গলালকেন”। ‘উত্তররামচরিতে’ সীতার “দধতি বিলোল-কবরীকমানম্”। ‘মালতীমাধবে’ মদনিকার “সংগেঃ বিহগ্ন মুখমারিচকবরী”। কপাল-কুণ্ডলার জন্ত প্রয়োজন ছিল ঝোড়ো এলোচুলের, এ না-হ’লে সমুদ্র অরণ্যের পরিবেশে তাকে মানায় না।

কপালকুণ্ডলার কেশভারের দ্বিতীয় গুণ এই যে তা ‘সংসদিত’। উর্বরীর চুলের পরিচয় দিতে গিয়ে পুরুষা বলেছেন—“মুদ্রপদনবিভিষা...গনকচিকলাপো নিঃসপত্রোহস্ত জাতঃ”। ‘কতুসংহারে’ “ব্যাগদিনীলললিতালক”।

স্বীয়, সে চুল রানীত 'কানধরীতে' চ'য়ালকথা:

কানধরীমখোমিলাকোভাসিমীম্" যনে পড়বে।

কানধরী কপালকুণ্ডলার কেশধার আঙুলফলিত। এটা অধিকার্যে, কারণ গোষ্ঠালি

কানধরী বিকৃতি আসতে পারে না। মহেকুণ্ডলো, যা ঠিক কেমন ছিল

না, আমি বলছি শুধুমাত্র কানধরীর কথা। যথেষ্ট পড়লেই যথেষ্ট

কানধরী নাথিকার চুল নিতম্বে আচ্ছাদে পড়ে—"শিরোরকটঃ শ্রোণিতটাবলম্বিতঃ"

কানধরীমখোমিলাকোভাসিমীম্,"—নিতম্বে ছাড়ে চুল আরো নেমে আসে

কানধরী চ'য়ালকথার, আঙুলফলিত নীল কক্কো বহিঃ তে। কপাল-

কপাল মীমা টেনে নিলে ডল্লক পথ।

কপাল হযেছে "অলকাবলীর প্রচুয়ে" ১০ হটতেছিল না—

কেশধারকেশধার চন্দ্রবলীর জায় প্রতীত 'হটচরিতের'

কেশধারকেশ "সমিহিতবানাককার ভাষন তিষ্ঠ" পারে।

কেশধার "কেশধারিতে স্বকেশে ও বাতমূল 'আচ্ছাদে' করিয়াছিল, স্বকেশে"

কেশধার, বাতমূলের বিমলকি কিছু কিছু দে 'অতুসংহারে'

কেশ "লগ্না"সংলগ্নিতাকুলকেশপাশ"।

কেশধারের পরিণীতা হ'য়ে সপগ্রামের বাসভবনের উপরে কপালকুণ্ডলা যখন

কপাল কানধরী জামাজনকীর সঙ্গে আলাপ করছেন, তখনকার কেশের বর্ণনা

কেশধার চন্দ্রবলীর, অধিকার্যে কেশধারমধ্যে প্রায় অধিকার্যে:

কেশধারের "মুখমসকলবাক্তিলম্বলকাতঃ" বর্ণনাটি কানধরী লেগে গেল।

কেশধার একবার পরে যোগিনী যখন গৃহিনী হ'য়েছেন তখন "সেই অসংখ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কেশধারের বাতমূল আঙুলফলিত কেশে পঞ্চাঙ্গাগে স্থলবেগী সন্ধ্য

কক্ষার কোমল রূপবর্ণন কৃতিত্বের জন্মের সর্বলক্ষণগত সঙ্গীতাদিগোষ্ঠিত মহাত্মকবিশেষ  
বেগী থেকে :

হনীলমণিতাপাকী সঙ্গীতাদিগোষ্ঠিতম্ ॥

সর্বলক্ষণসম্পন্নঃ মহাত্মকবিশেষম্ ।

কুহুমশোভিত 'কিরীটমণ্ডলবস্ত্র বেগী'-বর্ণনার পরমাখ 'রঘুবংশে' উন্মত্তীর বেগীর  
প্রভাব লক্ষ্য করা যায় "কুহুমোৎখতিতান্ বলীভূতশলয়ন্ ত্বন্দ্রকটত্বালকান্" ।

'কেশের যে ভাগ বেগীমধ্যে স্তম্ভ হয় নাই, তাহা যে শিরোপার সর্বত্র সমানোচ্চ  
হইয়া রহিয়াছে, এমন নহে। আকৃষ্টগ্রন্থকৃত কৃত কৃত রূপভরবরখায় শোভিত  
হইয়া রহিয়াছে।'—এই বর্ণনারও ইঙ্গিত আছে কালিদাসের "বলীভূতশলয়ন্"-এর  
মধ্যে। তারপর মুখের উপর বন্ধন-বিশ্রাসী কৃত কৃত অলকভূষ্ণের সাদৃশ্য পাই  
ইন্মত্তীর "উন্মত্তমণিতাপাকঃ মুখং তব" অংশে।

উক্তভাষ্যের শেষ প্যাক থেকে মনে হতে পারে, এখানে শকুন্তলার মুখখানি  
বন্ধিমের মনে পড়েছে। চন্দ্রসেনের আঁকা ছবি থেকে বিদ্যুৎ বিশেষ লক্ষণ মিলিয়ে শকুন্তলাকে  
চিনে বার করছেন : "তৎকমি জা এলা সিটিলবন্ধগুরুশকুন্তলমেণ কেশাচ্ছেন উব্ভিন্নগ্নে-  
অবিদ্বনা সজ্জবণ" ।

কপালকুণ্ডলার কুন্তলবর্ণনার বহির্ভূত সাহিত্যের দ্বারা প্রভাবিত হলেও  
তার আধুনিক দৃষ্টিভঙ্গিও একেবারে অপ্রত্যাশিত নয়। মেঘেনের খোলাচুল বন্ধিমের  
প্রিয় : কাছেই কপালকুণ্ডলার খোলাচুলে বেগী বাধলেন বটে, কিন্তু সে-বেগী বৈশিষ্ট্য  
রাখতে পারলেন না। তাকে আবার খুললেন; তাকে দিয়ে দাম্পত্য জীবনের উপর  
মারাত্মক সম্মেহ ঘনিষ্ঠে তুললেন। গবাক্ষের উপর দোচলামান কুহুমিত বস্ত্রলতা  
থেকে ব্রাহ্মণবেগীর খে-লিপি কপালকুণ্ডলা পেয়েছিলেন, সে-লিপি, কবরীবন্ধনে  
লুকিয়ে রেখেছিলেন। কিন্তু প্রয়োজনের সময় লিপি খুঁজে না পেয়ে বাধা হ'য়ে  
বেগীবন্ধন খুলতে হ'লে। "অনবকাশ প্রযুক্ত সে বিশালকেশরাশি পুনর্বিজ্ঞত করিতে  
পারে নাই, অতএব আজি কপালকুণ্ডলা অনঢ়াচালের মত কেশমণ্ডলমধ্যবর্তিনী হইয়া  
চলিলেন।" তারপর তিনি যখন অরণ্যে ব্রাহ্মণবেগীর সঙ্গে কথা বলছেন, তখন  
কাপালিক ও নবকুমার তাকে দূর থেকে দেখছিলেন "নবকুমার দেখিলেন,  
কপালকুণ্ডলা আলুলায়িতকুন্তলা। যখন কপালকুণ্ডলা তাঁহার হই নাই, তখনই সে  
কুন্তল ঠাণ্ডিত না। আবার দেখিলেন যে, সেটী কুন্তলরাশি আসিয়া ব্রাহ্মণকুমারের  
পৃষ্ঠদেশে পড়িয়া তাঁহার অঙ্গবিলম্বী কেশদামের সহিত মিলিয়াছে। কপালকুণ্ডলার  
কেশরাশি উদ্বল আয়তনশালী, এবং লঘুস্বরে কথোপকথনের প্রয়ো নে উভয়ে একত্র  
সম্মিলিতবর্তী হইয়া বসিয়াছিলেন যে, লুৎফ উরঃ পৃষ্ঠ পক্ষ কপালকুণ্ডলার কেশের

বহির্ভূত। তাহা তাঁহারা দেখিতে পান নাই। দেখিয়া নবকুমার দীর্ঘ  
 কাল বিষয়া পড়িলেন।" কেশের ঈদৃশ ব্যবহার সংস্কৃত কবির কল্পনায় ছিল না।  
 "সামন্তব্য" অপর রমণীদের অলকবর্ণনিতেও সংস্কৃত কাব্যের সঙ্গে সাদৃশ্য লক্ষ্য  
 করা। মতিবির 'নবচতুর্পদবর্ণনা'র ভ্রমরশ্রেণীর প্রায় সেই উজ্জল স্ত্রীমল্লিকা-  
 লবণ্যের পাশে ইন্দুমতীর "ভ্রুংকচন্দ্রবালকান্" এবং "উদমুচ্ছুদিতালকং মুখম্"  
 না। ভাষ্যহস্তীর ক্ষুদ্র মুখখানির "উপরোধে চারিদিক দিয়া ক্ষুদ্র ক্ষুদ্র বৃক্ষিত  
 বোধিয়া পড়িয়াছে।" 'কৃত্তসংহারের' নাট্যিকার মুখখানি মনে পড়বে, যার  
 ভাষ্যদমনীপিতৃকিত্তাগ্রান্"। ষোড়শ চুলে ভরা ছোট মুখখানির ছবি এসেছে  
 "কক্যাপাঙ্গপ্রসন্নমলকৈঃ" থেকে। সেই কৌকড়াচুলে-চাপুষা মুখখানি কেমন ?  
 "নীলোৎপল-দলরাতি উৎপলমধ্যাকৈ ঘিরিয়া ঘিরিয়া রাখিয়াছে।"—অর্থাৎ মুখখানি  
 কপাল থেকে নেমে-আসা কৌকড়ানো চুলগুলি হ'লে। নীলোৎপলের দলরাতি  
 বর্ণনায় চুলে মুখে মিলিয়ে একটা গোটা সৌন্দর্যের বর্ণনা; মুখখানিকে  
 চুল থেকে বিচ্ছিন্ন করা যায় না, যেমন যায় না চুলগুলোকে মুখ থেকে।  
 "কুলে 'মেঘদূতের' ঐ স্নোকেই শেষ চরণ—"মীনকোভাজলকুবলয়ত্রীতুলা-  
 নী।" "কক্যাপাঙ্গপ্রসন্নমলকৈঃ" এই অংশের সঙ্গে "মীনকোভাজলকুবলয়ত্রীতুলা-  
 নী" থেকে "মীনকোভাৎ" অংশটুকু বাদ দিলে বাক্যমূলত স্ত্রীমল্লিকা-  
 বর্ণনা হবে। কিন্তু "মীনকোভাৎ" যে একেবারে বাদ পড়েছে তা নয়,  
 বরং তা লক্ষ্যবিন্দুর কেন্দ্রবিন্দুর মধ্যে প্রবেশ করেছে—"সফরি সপ্তম অঙ্গুলিগুলি ক্ষুদ্র  
 বিন্দুর কেন্দ্রবিন্দু মধ্যে স্তম্ভ হইয়াছে।"  
 "সংস্কৃত কাব্যহস্তীর" বোলাচুল পরীক্ষা ক'রে দেখা গেল, যে বাক্যের  
 "সংস্কৃত কাব্যের" দ্বারা যথেষ্ট পরিমাণে প্রভাবিত। 'সদৃশ' সেই সঙ্গে আছে  
 "সদৃশ" শব্দটির ইচ্ছা—বস্তুবাদ (illusion of reality) সৃষ্টি করার অপর ক্ষমতা।  
 "সংস্কৃত" শব্দগত নয়, বর্ণনার ভাষাগতও বটে। সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যকে তিনি এমন  
 "সংস্কৃত" ক'রে তুলেছিলেন যে তাঁর বহু বর্ণনা ও ভাবপ্রকাশের তির্যকভঙ্গী থেকে  
 "সংস্কৃত" বা তিনি সংস্কৃত কাব্যের নিকট স্বামী, যদিও তা নয়। সংস্কৃত  
 "সংস্কৃত" প্রতিভাবলে বস্তুবাদে গ্রহণ করতে পারলে যে কী অঘটন  
 | যাহ, বাস্তবের নব নব উদ্বেগগুলিনী প্রতিভা তাঁর প্রমাণ।

৩.

কপালগুলার রূপবর্ণনার দ্বিতীয় উপকরণ দেহ। তা'র দেহটি কেমন ?—  
 "দেহের, যেন চিত্রপটের উপর চিত্র, ঘাইতেছে।" কপালকুণ্ডলার



দেহকে বক্ষি দেখেছেন তার কেশভারের পটভূমিতে। কেশভার যেন চিত্রপট, তাতে যেহিঁ তার সগাথব নিয়ে হলো ঝাঁক। ছবি। তাই 'চিত্রপটের উপর চিত্র'। এ-কল্পনা চিত্র-শিল্পের অভিজ্ঞতা থেকে আসা বাস্তবিক, তবুও যেন 'শকুন্তলার' একটি শ্লোকের অঙ্কশ্ৰবণ একে স্পর্শ করেছে। কালিদাস শকুন্তলার রূপবর্ণনা প্রদত্ত বলেছেন "চিত্রে নিবেস্ত পরিকল্পিতসম্বোধাগা" অর্থাৎ আগে একটা খসড়া তৈরী হলো, পরে তাতে সম্বোধাগ। খসড়ার উপর রঙ বুলিয়ে এ-যেন ছবিকে জীবন্ত করে তোলাবার পদ্ধতি। চিত্রাঙ্কনের এমনি চেতনা কালিদাসের 'কুমারসম্ভবে'ও লক্ষ্য করা যায় পার্বতীর রূপাতিশয্য বাক্যের প্রসঙ্গে। সেখানে এই অস্ব-শৈলী আরও স্পষ্ট, আরও উজ্জ্বল "উন্নীলিতং তুলিকযেব চিত্রং স্বধাঃশুভিভিন্নিবিয়ারবিনম"। কালিদাসের চিত্রচেতনা এই অলঙ্কারের মধ্যে খজা ভাগা পেয়েছে। নিম্নলিখিত পদ এখানে চিত্রপট, স্বর্ধের কিরণ রঙের তুলি। তুলির টানে রঙের ছোপ পেয়ে ছবি উঠল মৃত হয়ে, স্বর্ধের কিরণও নিম্নলিখিত পদ্যকে তুলল ছুটিয়ে। শকুন্তলার চিত্রসম্পর্কে একটু ভেবে দেখলে মনে হবে, কালিদাসের চিত্রের উপরই ডো সম্বোধাগ। সম্বোধাগের মধ্যেই পূর্ণ প্রাণের ছবি; তবু তার পটভূমি হলো ঐ চিত্র। অতএব কালিদাসের চিত্র হচ্ছে চিত্রপট, সম্বোধাগে তার ছবি। বক্ষিও ঠিক এই কথাই বলেছেন কিন্তু নৃতন 'দৃষ্টিকোন থেকে। কালিদাসে যা চিত্র, বক্ষিমে তা কেশভার। এর পরেরটুকু পরিষ্কার করে কালিদাসও বলেননি, বক্ষিও 'দেহরঙ' বলে শেষ করেছেন। সৌন্দর্য কী বর্ণনা দিয়ে বোঝানো যায়? শুধে "লাবণ্যমিবাকনাহ"। দেহ নিয়ে বক্ষি বাড়াবাড়ি করেননি, করতে গেলে যে সর্বঅঙ্গের সঙ্গে পয়োপর, নিতম্ব, এমন কি ত্রিবলীও এসে পড়বে। অতটা তার কালে সম্ভব ছিল না। এর ক্ষতিপূরণে তিনি যা দিয়েছেন, তা সংস্কৃত কবিরাজ দিতে পারেননি। সে-কথায় পরে আসছি।

মতিবিবির দেহ বক্ষি 'ঈষদীর্ণ দেহ' বলেই চূপ করেছেন, শ্রামা বিষয়ে বলেছেন, 'তীহার ক্ষুদ্র দেহ'। ক্ষতিপূরণ হে। এই, দেহাধারের সামগ্রিকতার যে একটা সাম্যবিধি, সমগ্রকাশ, তা তিনি প্রতিটি চরিত্রের ব্যক্তিত্বের আবহেই বলে গেছেন। তা না-হলে সংস্কৃতের নায়িকায়াত্রের যে-দশা, রূপবর্ণনার যে-সামান্য ধর্ম, তা এসে পড়ত। অতএব বলা যেতে পারে, রূপবর্ণনায় সংস্কৃতের অমুগম্যী হলোও বক্ষি সংস্কৃত রূপবর্ণনায় একঘেয়েমির সংস্কার করেছেন। কপালকুণ্ডলার নানা অঙ্গের বর্ণনা করে বক্ষি শেষে বলেছেন : "মুতিমধ্যে যে একটি মোহিনী শক্তি ছিল, তাহা বর্ণিতে পারা যায় না"। অপরপক্ষে লুৎফ-উল্লিয়ার দেহমহিমা তার অলঙ্কারীতে নয়, জয়গুণে নয়, কপোলে নয়, গুণাধরে নয়, নয়নে নয়, কটাক্ষে নয়, গ্রীবাভঙ্গিতেও নয়। "সেই কুণ্ডলকণিনী মূর্তির প্রতি নিরীক্ষণ করিতে করিতে মনস্কামার ভীত হইলেন।

অনিচ্ছনীয় দেহমহিমা এখন যেকোন দেহিতে পাঠিলেন, সেক্ষণ আর কখনও  
। কিং যে 'সি' বহুশব্দক বিভাজনের গ্রন্থ মনোমোহিনী, দেখিয়া ভয়  
কপালকুণ্ডলাও 'সি' বহুশব্দক মূখে দেখেছিল—“মুগ্ধারাম পরম কলর, হুম্মরী  
বহু গ্রন্থ কলর কিং রমনীভরত তেজোবাহিনী”

## তথ্য

সি। গণের বর্ণনা। গিয়ে বহিমুখ লিপেছেন যে তার “বিশাল-  
সি। অতি হির, অতি অতি গভীর অথচ জ্যোতির্বিদ্যে সে কটাক এই  
। ক্রিয়াক্ষম চক্রকিরণের গ্রন্থ অধোজ্ঞান দীপ্তি পাঠেছিল।  
। বর্ণনা সংস্কৃতে নেই। সেখানে হুম্মরীদের। পাত চলাপালের দৃষ্টি  
। কটাক লাগে। ভীষ্মের উদাত্ত চিত্রসমূহের দর্শন যে-চোপ,  
। কটাক সাহিত্যের বর্ণনাদের ভক্ত সে-চোপের দরকার হয় না। বহিমুখ  
। কালকুণ্ডলার নয়ন ‘বিশাল’, ‘আকর্ষণীয়’। তবে কতদূর পৃথক টান।  
। তার সীমা নির্দেশ করেছেন বাণভট্ট। ‘হর্ষচরিতে’ সরস্বতীর আকর্ষণ-  
। ‘শ্রোতব্যের’ বিবরণসমূহসিদ্ধ। প্রকাশ্যস্বীকারনির্গতেন লোচনাভ-  
। ‘। বহিমুখের বর্ণনায় কপালকুণ্ডলার লোচনের বিশালতার পরিমাণ নির্ভর  
। কটাক কতকগুলি বিশেষণের উপর। সে-কটাক “অতি হির, অতি হির,  
। অথচ জ্যোতির্বিদ্যে”। অর্থাৎ চোপকে বিশাল করে বর্ণনা করবার দৃষ্টিভঙ্গী  
। কটাক বিশেষণের মাল্যরচনার প্রবণতাও উপস্থিত, তবে তাকে প্রকাশ  
। কটাক একালের। এ-বর্ণনায় সংস্কৃতে হোয়াচ যে লেগে আছে, তার  
। কটাকবর্ণনার উপমায় “সে কটাক, এই মগধরূপে ক্রিয়াক্ষম চক্রকিরণ  
। সি। ক্রিয়াক্ষম দীপ্তি পাঠেছিল।”। মুদ্রভঙ্গি কটাকের এই মাদুর  
। ‘মোহমুহ’ থেকে, যেখানে আছে “উৎপাদ্যায় প্রতীক্য মদৌবীচি  
। ‘কটাকহারের’ “কটাকহারে কটাকহারে”। অংশটিও মনে  
। কটাক। চোপের বর্ণনা এখনও শেষ হয়নি। “রমনীও স্পন্দহীন, অনিমেঘ  
। কালকুণ্ডলার দৃষ্টি নবকুমারের মুখে কলর করিয়া রাখিলেন। উভয়মুখো  
। যে, নবকুমারের দৃষ্টি চমকিত লোকের দৃষ্টির গ্রন্থ রমনীর দৃষ্টিতে  
। কটাক নাট, কটাক বিশেষ প্রকাশ হইতেছিল।”  
। কটাক দৃষ্টি নিম্নলিখিত একালের। তবুও এ-চিহ্ন যে সংস্কৃতে একবারে  
। কটাক। আশ্রয় বলছি, “অনিমেঘ লোচনে বিশাল চক্রকিরণ দৃষ্টি নবকুমারের  
। কটাক রাখিলেন”— ই কটাকের কথা। ‘হর্ষচরিতে’র দাঁচ এখন সরস্বতীর

হুতীর থেকে বিদায় নিয়ে যাচ্ছেন, তখন মরশুও তাঁর দিকে অমনি ভাবে তাকিয়ে ছিলেন—“তুরগাধিকঃ চ তং প্রযাচ্ছং মরশুও গচিরমুদ্রান্তপক্ষা নিশ্চলতারকেন-  
লিখিতেনেব চক্ষু বালোকয়ং”।

স্বামীর নয়নমুগল “বিস্ফারিত, কোমল, বেতবর্ণ”। ‘বিস্ফারিত’ শব্দটি সংস্কৃতে চোখের বর্ণনায় বহুল ব্যবহৃত। ‘কোমলে’ কমলের পেলবতা আছে। সংস্কৃত কবিরা চোখের উপমায় কমলকুলয়ের মণা দিয়ে যা বোঝাতে চান, এখানেও সেই বোধ বাহ্য হয়ে উঠেছে। তারপর ‘বেতবর্ণ’। বেতবর্ণ কী? চোখের বেত অংশ, না চোখের কালো তারা, না চোখের স্বচ্ছ দৃষ্টি? কোনটা? বহিঃ এখানে নিশ্চয়ই দৃষ্টিকে বুঝিয়েছেন। চোখের দৃষ্টির সম্বন্ধে সংস্কৃত কবিরূপিত্তি আছে দৃষ্টিকে ধবলরূপে বর্ণনা করাই কবিসম্ম পদ্ধতি। ‘হৃগচরিত’ের মরশুও বিস্ময়কে যখন দেখছেন, তখন “মার্গপরিভ্রান্তমমপদবি ধবলিতদংশিশা দৃশা”। তাই স্বামীর নয়নমুগলও বেতবর্ণ।

মতিবিবির চক্ষু দুইটি “অতিবিশাল নহে, কিন্তু বহিঃ পল্লববরাবিশিষ্ট—আর অতিশয় উজ্জল। তাহার কটাক্ষ স্থির, অথচ মর্মভেদী। তোমার উপর দৃষ্টি পড়িলে তুমি তৎক্ষণাৎ অস্থিত কর যে, এ স্ত্রীলোক তোমার মন পথস্থ দেখিতেছে, দেখিতে দেখিতে সে মর্মভেদী দৃষ্টির ভাবান্তর হয়; চক্ষু মহোমল রেহময় রসে গলিয়া যায়। আবার কখন বা তাহাতে কেবল স্থাবশেজনিভ ক্রান্তি প্রকাশ পায়, যেন সে নয়ন ময়ূখের স্বপ্নশয্যা। কখন বা লালাবিস্ফারিত মন্দরসে টলটলায়মান। আবার কখন গোলাপাশে ক্রুর কটাক্ষ—যেন মেঘমথো বিভ্রাম্য।”

এ-বর্ণনা শুধু চোখের অংগণন করা নয়—সুন্দরী কটাক্ষের ক্ষমতার আভিহিত নয়, মতিবিবির জীবনব্যাপী সত্তার নিত্য উদ্ভাবিত ইতিহাসের সংক্ষিপ্ত সূত্র। জীবনের নিত্য নব নব আশ্বাদের চেতনাভরা এমন চোখের বর্ণনা সংস্কৃতে তো নেই-ই, বহিঃের সমসাময়িক বাংলা সাহিত্যেও উল্লেখ। এ-চোখ বিশাল না-হয়েও উজ্জল, কটাক্ষ স্থির হয়েও মর্মভেদী। এ-চোখ যাকে দেখে তার মর্ম পঙ্ক শুধু দেখে নেয় না, দেখতে দেখতে দৃষ্টিরও ভাবান্তর হয় সে-দৃষ্টি কখনও বা ঘেঁষে বিগলিত, কখনও বা স্থাবশেজনিভ ক্রান্তিতে করণ, কখনও তাতে লালসা ভাগে, আবার কখনও বা বিভ্রম্যস্তি। এট চোখ ময়ূখের স্বপ্নশয্যা।

আধুনিক জীবনের নিতানুতন আকাঙ্ক্ষায় জীর্ণ হ’য়ে জীবনকে পুরোপুরিভাবে ভোগ করার ব্যাকুলতা প্রকাশ করলেও এই বর্ণনার মধ্যে সংস্কৃত রীতি, বিশেষ করে বাণভট্টের রীতিও মুখর হয়ে উঠেছে। বর্ণনার প্রথম অংশে বিষমভাবের ভোতনা। প্রথম বাক্য দুটি মনে পড়িয়ে দেয় ‘হৃগচরিত’, “সন্ধিহিতবাগাঙ্করা।

বিদিক, পুণ্ডরীকমণী হরিণলোচনা চ, বালাতপপ্রভাধরা কুমুদাসিনী চ, সমদহংসধনা  
কমলোদয়া চ, কমলকোমলকরা হিমগিরিশিলাপুশ্পনিতম্বা চ, করতো : বিড়ম্বিত-  
চ, অমৃতকুমারভাবা সিদ্ধহারকা চ।”

দ্বিতীয় অংশের বর্ণনা আধুনিক চেতনাসত্ত্বাত হলেও বাণভট্টের মহাশ্বেতাবর্ণনা  
কাজাকাছি। মহাশ্বেতার রূপের লাবণ্য দৃষ্টার নয়নপথের ভিতর দিয়ে তার  
প্রবেশ করে তার চিত্তলোক স্তম্ভবর্ণ করে তুলছে—“অমৃতপুষ্করিণি লোচনপথপ্রবিনে  
কানমিব যনোময়স্বীম”। বহ্নিম বলছেন—“তোমার উপর দৃষ্টি পড়িলে তুমি  
কালং অমৃত কর । এ স্বীলোক তোমার মন পর্বন্ত দেখিতেছে।” বহ্নিময়ুগের  
বাণভট্টের থাকলে আমরা বহ্নিমের কথাকেই আরও সরস করে, বহীন করে,  
রূপে পেতাম। কিন্তু দুই যুগের ব্যবধান প্রশংহ। “আবার স্বপন লোলাপাকে  
কটাক”—যেন মেঘমধ্যে বিড়াক্ষম, ‘মেঘদূত’ থেকে আগত উচ্ছ্বাসী শ্রমজীবীর  
ধার নেওয়া হ’য়েছে

বিড়াক্ষমক্ষুরিতচকিতৈত্তত্র পৌরাক্ষনানাম্  
লোলাপাকৈবহ্নি ময়সে লোচনৈবকিতোহসি।

বর্ণনার প্রথম অংশে বাণভট্টের পদ্ধতির কথা বলেছি। শেষ অংশে “মহাশ্বেতা  
কুমার” নকশা চিত্রটি সংস্কৃতের, বিশেষ করে বাণভট্টের, কিন্তু বাণীটি বহ্নিমের।  
এটা পড়লেই মনে হবে সংস্কৃত থেকে নেওয়া কিন্তু তা নয়। এইখানে রীতির  
মিছে বহ্নিম বস্তুধার সৃষ্টি করেছেন।

মতিবিবির চোখের বর্ণনা এখানেই শেষ হয়নি। স্বীবনের যে-ভূমিকায় আমরা  
তাঁর চোখ দুটি দেখে নিয়েছি, সে-ভূমিকায় আর সে ফিরবে না। আগার ঘনি  
এ চোখজোড়ার দেখা পাই, তাও নতুন ভূমিকায়। নবকুমারের ভ্রম আগ্রা-  
কিথান ভেড়ে এসেও কিছুতেই সে যখন তাকে পেল না, তখন আমরা তাঁর যে-  
চোখ দেখছি, সে-চোখ যোদ্ধাবেশিনী সংহারিণী নারীরই ভয়ঙ্করী মূর্তির : তখন  
স্বপন উন্নত করিয়া, ঈশং বহ্নিম গ্রীবাভঙ্গি করিয়া নবকুমারের মূখপ্রতি অনিমেঘ  
আত চক্ষু স্থাপিত করিয়া রাজরাজ্যোত্তমী পাড়াইলেন। .....জ্যোতির্ময় চক্ষু  
যিক্রমধুরিত সমুদ্রবাবিবং কলসিতে লাগিল।” মতিবিবির এই সময়কার চোখের  
প্রতি সবে সাগরতীরে কপালকুণ্ডলার চোখের অনেকটা মিল আছে। পার্বত্য যেমন  
স্রোতের, তেমনি উপমানের চন্দ্র-স্বর্ধের। কপালকুণ্ডলার কটাক “এই সাগর হ্রদে  
বিদ্যমান চন্দ্রকিরণলগ্নার স্নায় সিদ্ধোজ্জল দীপ্তি পাঠিতেছিল।” রাক্ষসবশীর ভূমিকায়  
মতিবিবির “চক্ষু দুইটি বিদ্যোত্তেজঃ পরিপূর্ণ”।

## ৫. বর্ণ

সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যে রূপসীমার নানা প্রত্যয়ের বর্ণনার বৈচিত্র্য কথ্য তুলেছিলাম শুধু এ-সম্প্রদেয় যে বহির্মুখ তার দ্বারা কতটা প্রভাবিত হয়েছেন তার পরীক্ষা করব ব'লে।

সাধারণতঃ কপালকুণ্ডলার অঙ্গপ্রত্যঙ্গের আর বর্ণনা করবেন কী! সবই যে তার কৃষ্ণলজ্জালে ঢাকা পড়ে গেছে! তবুও কেশভার, দেহরত্ন, মুখমণ্ডল, চক্ষু, স্বচ্ছদেশ ও বাহুযুগলের উল্লেখ করতে বহির্মুখ ভোলেননি। পরে শ্রীমাহেশ্বরীর সান্নিধ্যে এসে প্রদান শিখে অনেকটা হাসকসজ্জা নাড়িকার মতো! সঙ্ঘাত কপালকুণ্ডলা যখন নবকুমারের শয়নকক্ষে বসে নন্দনের সঙ্গে কথা বলছিলেন, তখন কেশ, মুখ ও বর্ণের সঙ্গে বর্ণ ও কণ্ঠের অলঙ্কৃত বর্ণনা আছে। পার্থচন্দ্র ব'লে শ্রীমাহেশ্বরীর দেহ, কেশ, মুখ ও শরীর-সম্পূর্ণ আচরণের বর্ণনাতেই শেষ হয়েছে। মতিবিবির প্রসঙ্গে প্রথমত বর্ণের সঙ্গে ভ্রুগুণ, কপোলদেশ, ওষ্ঠাধর, চক্ষু ও মণালগ্রীবা পঞ্চ বর্ণনা করেছেন। তারপর চটিতে নবকুমারের সঙ্গে যখন কপালকুণ্ডলাকে তিনি দেখতে চলেছেন, তখন কোন অঙ্গে কী অলঙ্কার পরেছেন, তা বলতে গিয়ে কৃষ্ণল, কবরী, কপাল, নয়ন-পার্থ, বর্ণ, কণ্ঠ, হৃদয় ও বাহুযুগের উল্লেখ করেছেন। নবকুমার যখন মতিবিবিকে উপেক্ষা করে চ'লে আগছিলেন, তখন মতিবিবি যে-দণ্ডিত ভঙ্গিতে দাঁড়িয়ে নবকুমারের দিকে তাকিয়েছিলেন তার বর্ণনা প্রসঙ্গেও মস্তক, গ্রীবা, চক্ষু, ললাটদেশ ও নাসারন্ধ্রের বর্ণনা আছে। আবার ব্রাহ্মণদেবী মতিবিবি যখন কপালকুণ্ডলার সামনে এসে দাঁড়িয়েছেন, তখন তার মুখমণ্ডল, কেশ, পৃষ্ঠদেশ, অঙ্গ, বাহুদেশ, বক্ষ, ললাট ও চক্ষুর প্রসঙ্গ তোলা হয়েছে। অতএব রূপবর্ণনার আলম্বন হিসাবে সংস্কৃত অঙ্গপ্রত্যঙ্গ বর্ণনার যে-রীতির কথা বলছিলাম, বহির্মুখ যে সেই রীতিই যেমন নিয়েছেন, এ-কথা প্রতিপন্ন হ'লো।

রূপবর্ণনার অতঃপর আলম্বন হচ্ছে বর্ণ। সাধারণতঃ কপালকুণ্ডলার বর্ণপরিচয়—“অর্ধচন্দ্র-নিঃসৃত কোমলবর্ণ”। আবার তিনি যখন নবকুমারের গৃহে এসে শ্রীমাহেশ্বরীর সঙ্গে সৌদের উপরে দাঁড়িয়ে চারদিক দেখছিলেন, তখন তার বর্ণনাপ্রসঙ্গে বহির্মুখ বলছেন—“উদয়া একজন চন্দ্ররশ্মিবর্ণাভা”। শ্রীমাহেশ্বরী ‘কৃষ্ণাঙ্গী’, কিন্তু “পাঠকমহাশয় বুঝিছেন যে চন্দ্ররশ্মিবর্ণশোভিনী কপালকুণ্ডলা” নবকুমারের শয়নকক্ষে সালস্বারা কপালকুণ্ডলার “বর্ণ সেই অর্ধপূর্ণ শশাঙ্করশ্মিকচিহ্ন”।

মতিবিবির বর্ণের পরিচয় দিতে গিয়ে প্রথমে যে-ভূমিকার অবতারণা করেছেন, তাতে প্রকৃতপক্ষে হৃদয়বর্ণের অঙ্গ-বর্ণনার এক তুলনামূলক পাঠ উপস্থিত করা হয়েছে। এর থেকে বোঝা যাবে বহির্মুখ নারীর বর্ণ-বর্ণনার প্রকৃত উৎস কোথায়।

“বাহাদিগকে প্রকৃতপক্ষে গৌরবর্ণী বলি, তাহাদিগের মধ্যে কাহারও বর্ণ পূর্ণচন্দ্র-কৌমুদীর ত্যায়, কাহারও কাহারও ঈষদারকুবদনা উপায় ত্যায়। ইহার বর্ণ এতদ্ব্যবধিত ;

জ্বরায় ইহাকে প্রকৃত গৌরানী বলিলাম না বলে, কিন্তু মুগ্ধকরী শক্তিতে ইহার বর্ণও ম্লান নহে। ইনি জামবর্ণ। 'জামা মা' বা 'জামহুম্বর' যে জামবর্ণের উদাহরণ, এ সে জামবর্ণ নহে, তপ্তকাকনের যে জামবর্ণ, এ সেট জাম। পূর্ণচন্দ্র-স্বরলোপ, 'জব্বা হেমাধ্বকিরীটিনী' উষা যদি গৌরানীদিগের বর্ণপ্রতিমা হয়, তবে বসন্তপ্রসূত নবচূতলরাঙ্গির গোড়া এই জামার বর্ণের অতরূপ বলা খাটতে পারে। পাঠকমহাশয়দিগের মধ্যে অনেকে গৌরানীবর্ণের প্রতিষ্ঠা করিতে পারেন, কিন্তু এক্ষণে জামার মধ্যে মুগ্ধ হইলে, তবে তাঁহাকে বর্ণজ্ঞানশূন্য বলিতে পারিব না।"

উক্ত অংশগুলিতে কপালকুণ্ডলা ও মতিবিবির বর্ণক্ষেপের তাৎপর্য আলোচনা প্রসঙ্গে বলতে চাই, চন্দ্রবীরের বর্ণ-বিজ্ঞানে বহিমের মন সংস্কৃতকায়ের আলোচ্যায় অহসস্বামী। সংস্কৃতকায়ের চন্দ্রবীরের বর্ণ সাধারণত কৌমুদীবর্ণ। কৌমুদীবর্ণ বলিলে ঠিক বলা হ'লো না,—রোমান্টিক বর্ণ। সেট রোমান্টিক বর্ণ কখনও বা জ্যোৎস্নার পরাগ যথেষ্ট, কখনও বা উষার রক্তিম আভাষ স্নাত হ'য়ে, কখনও বা সোনালি মেঘের বর্ণখালি নিয়ে রঙ পেলতে-পেলতে পাঠকমানসে এক অনির্বচনীয় বোধে ধরা দেয়। সেই অনির্বচনীয় রূপকে কুড়িয়ে আনতে-আনতে যেটুকু শেষ পর্যন্ত বহিমের হাতে উঠেছে, সেটুকু হ'লো সেট "পূর্ণচন্দ্রকৌমুদী" অথবা "ঈশবার কুবদনা" বা "হেমাধ্বকিরীটিনী উষা"। 'উত্তররাচরিতের' সীতার রূপ কুড়িয়ে কপালকুণ্ডলার চিত্র পেয়েছিলেন জ্যোৎস্না-বর্ণ—"ললিতললিতৈ জ্যোৎস্নাপ্রায়ঃ" কপালকুণ্ডলার বর্ণ-বিজ্ঞানে প্রায় সর্বত্র বহিম অপচন্দ্রের কল্পনা এনেছেন, পূর্ণচন্দ্রের নয়। এর মূলেও সংস্কৃত প্রভাব কাজ করেছে। শকুন্তলার রূপবর্ণনা করতে গিয়ে কালিদাস এক জয়গায় বলেছেন—"নাতিপরিফুটরীরলাবণ্য"। লাবণ্যের এই নাতিপরিফুটের মূলেই সৌন্দর্য। রূপের প্রতি এই যে চিরায়মান আকাঙ্ক্ষা, অচরিতার্থ অভীশা—সৌন্দর্যোপনিষদের তা হ'লো চরম রহস্য। বহিম এ কথা বুঝতেন বলে কপালকুণ্ডলার বর্ণ-বর্ণনার প্রায় সর্বত্র অপচন্দ্রের উপমা এনেছেন। সংস্কৃত কবির। নানা রূপবিজ্ঞানের মধ্যেও বর্ণের যে-রোমান্টিকতার ইঙ্গিত রেখে গেছেন, বহিম তা অস্ত্রধাবন করতে পেরেছিলেন বলেই তাঁর ভুলিতে গোটা চাঁদ ফোটেনি, ফুটেছে আধফালি চাঁদ। মহাদেবের কপালে এই আধফালি চাঁদের প্রথম সংকেত।

অপরপক্ষে মতিবিবির বর্ণপরিচয়ে বহিম 'মেঘদূতের' ৭ স্তম্ভের বর্ণ দার নিয়ে। এই নারী বসন্তাস্তার নতোই 'জামা'। "জামা মা" বা 'জামহুম্বর' যে জামবর্ণের উদাহরণ, এ সে জামবর্ণ নহে, তপ্তকাকনের যে জামবর্ণ, এ সেট জাম। এই তপ্তকাকনের ব্যাখ্যা মিতে গিয়ে "বসন্তপ্রসূত নবচূতলরাঙ্গির গোড়া"র বর্ণ নেওয়া হয়েছে। তাতে 'জামার' অর্থ হ'য়ে উঠেছে সংস্কৃতে থাকে বলে 'আত্মা'। অথচ তপ্তকাকনবর্ণ

ও তামাতে রং এক জিনিশ নয়। বাণভট্ট এরূপ স্থলে খুব সতর্ক হ'য়েই কথা বলেছেন। 'হর্ষচরিতে' বিহুঙ্কির বর্ণনাগ্রসঙ্গে বলেছেন—“প্রাঃসমুত্তপ্ততর্ণনীয়ত্তমাব্যম্যতম্”। বাণভট্টের এই উত্তপ্ত ও তর্ণনীয় স্বর্ণই হ'লো 'মেঘদূতের' 'জামা'।

৬.

এতক্ষণ আমরা 'কপালকুণ্ডলা' উপন্যাসের তিনটি নারী চরিত্রের প্রত্যেকটি অঙ্গ পৃথকভাবে ও সেই বিবিধ অঙ্গ নিয়ে তুলনামূলকভাবে পর্যবেক্ষণ ক'রে দেখছিলাম। এখন আমরা প্রত্যেকটি চরিত্রের রূপকে পূর্ণাঙ্গভাবে দেখতে চাই, দেখতে চাই কোন রূপটি কী-ভাবে প্রকাশ পেয়েছে এবং প্রত্যেকটি রূপের পূর্ণরূপের মধ্যে তার বিচ্ছিন্ন পৃথক অঙ্গের রূপবর্ণনা সংগত হয়েছে কিনা। তাছাড়া রূপের এই পূর্ণরূপের মধ্যে সংস্কৃত প্রভাব কতখানি সেটাও আমাদের জিজ্ঞাস্য থাকবে।

হুমস্ক্রিতা কপালকুণ্ডলা যখন নবকুমারের শয়নকক্ষে আসীন তখন তার “সেই অসংখ্য কুমোচ্ছল, ভূজেশ্বর বাহতুল্য, আঙুলকলষিত কেশরাজির পশ্চাত্তাগে স্থলবেগী সঞ্চ হইয়াছে। বেগীরচনায়ও শিল্পপরিপাট্য লক্ষিত হইতেছে, কেশবিশ্রাসে অনেক হৃদয় কাকর্ষ্য জামাহনুসারীর বিভ্রাসকৌশলের পরিচয় দিতেছে। কুমুদমাণ্ড পুরিতাক্ত হয় নাই, চতুশ্চাৰ্ঘ্যে কীরীটমণ্ডলস্বরূপ বেগী বেটন করিয়া রহিয়াছে। কেশের যে-ভাগ বেগীমধ্যে রূপত হয় নাই, তাহা যে শিরোপরি সর্বত্র সমানোক্ত হইয়া রহিয়াছে, এমত নহে। আকৃকমগ্রযুক্ত ক্ষুদ্র ক্ষুদ্র কৃষ্ণতরঙ্গরেখায় শোভিত হইয়া রহিয়াছে। মুখমণ্ডল এখন আর কেশভারে অর্ধলুক্কায়িত নহে; জ্যোতির্ময় হইয়া শোভা পাইতেছে, কেবল স্থানে স্থানে বস্তুনিবিস্তারী ক্ষুদ্র ক্ষুদ্র অলকগুচ্ছ তদুপরি বেদবিষ্মদিত হইয়া রহিয়াছে। বর্ণ সেই অর্ধপূর্ণশাঙ্করাশ্মিচরিত। এখন দুই কর্ণে হেমকর্ণকুণ্ডা দুলিতেছে; কণ্ঠে হিরণ্ময় কর্ণমালা দুলিতেছে। বর্ণের নিকট স্নেহকল মান হয় নাই, অর্ধচন্দ্র-কৌমুদী-বসনা ধরণীর অঙ্গে নৈশকুম্বমবৎ শোভা পাইতেছে। তাহার পরিধানে শুক্লাবর; সে শুক্লাবর অর্ধচন্দ্রদীপ্ত আকাশমণ্ডলে অনিবিড় শুক্লমেঘের ত্রায় শোভা পাইতেছে।”

উক্ত অঙ্কচ্ছেদ পূর্বাধের আলোচনা স্থানান্তরে করছি। উত্তরাধ সম্পর্কে বক্তব্য আছে। বসনে-ভূষণে কপালকুণ্ডলার যে-রূপবর্ণনা করা হয়েছে, তাতে সংস্কৃত প্রভাব স্পষ্ট। কানে সোনার দুল, গলায় সোনার মালা, পরনে শুভ্রবাস এতে তাকে জ্যোৎস্না-স্নাত কুম্ভিত পৃথিবীর মতই সুন্দর দেখাচ্ছে। কিন্তু চন্দ্রালোককে বসনরূপে কল্পনার প্রেরণা বন্ধিম কি কালিদাসের ‘ঋতুসংহার’ থেকে পাননি, যেখানে আছে—“জ্যোৎস্না-দুকূলমমলং ... দধামা” ? জ্যোৎস্না হ'লো ধরণীর বসন। কপালকুণ্ডলার শুক্লাবরও “অর্ধচন্দ্র-দীপ্ত আকাশমণ্ডলে অনিবিড় শুক্ল মেঘের ত্রায়”। বসনকে মেঘরূপে কল্পনার উৎস

বাগডটের 'হৃৎকরিতো' মালতীর দমনের উপমা "শারদীর খেতখেতবিরল  
 কলরপটলাবৃত্তা জো:"। সংস্কৃত উপক্রমে নাট্যকানের প্রায় সকলেই ভাবা  
 বস্তু তত্ত্ববসনা। 'কাদম্বরী'র প্রত্যেকের প্রতিভারী "শরদির কলহা-সমরলাখরা",  
 "বহাবোতা" "আগ্রপদীনেন চ প্রভাবসিতেনাপি প্রাপ্তবিনিত্যাম্", কাদম্বরী  
 "গৌরীমিব খেতাঃশুকরচিতোক্তমা" "হৃদ্যবিনয়নে  
 প্রজাপ্রভানেবাস্তকেমাজ্জানিতভুলতা:", এণ "দৌতদবলনেত্রনিমিত্তে  
 নির্মোকলমূতেরোগপ্রপদীনেন কথুকেন তিরোহিতভুলতা"। কপালকুণ্ডলার স্তব্ধাঙ্গর যদি  
 তত্বে যেয হয়, তাহ'লে সোনার চল, আর সোনার হার "অঙ্কচ... ঢাকা পড়বে কেন?  
 নক্ষত্রপুঞ্জের ছটা নিয়ে আগ্রেক, যেমন এসেছিল মালতীর বেলায়—"চারণামলকীকলনিমূল-  
 ত্তাকালেন স্মৃতিত প্লবৎ প্রবীর গোবৎসাবসনের সঙ্গে পুষ্পালঙ্কার নয়,  
 নক্ষত্র-অলঙ্কারের সংগতি ছিল। কিন্তু তা যদিই বলে হতাশ  
 কারণ নেই। জি মূলে নক্ষত্রের সঞ্চিত আছে বাগডটের  
 লীলায় নক্ষত্রপুঞ্জকে ফুল আকাশের ঘে লুটিয়ে দেখেছি।  
 প্রকৃতির সঙ্গে মূলকে অলঙ্কাররূপে করুন। বিন্দুসং, 'কুতুম্ভঃ'

প্রভিন্নবৈচিত্র্যনির্ভে কৃৎস্নকুটিল: সমাচিত:

বিভাতি শুভে তববহুভূমিত: পরাভবদেব দিগ্ভিত্তিক:

সালঙ্কার মতিবিবির "নিবলঙ্কার খচিত করিয়াছেন.  
 বেগানে বাহা ধরে—কুস্থলে, কদরীতে, কপালে, জন্মে, বাহুগুণে,  
 গবৎ স্ববর্ণমধ্য হইতে হীরকাদিরই কলসিতেছে। মোরের ঢকু অস্থির হইল।  
 প্রকৃত নক্ষত্রমালাভূষিত আকাশের গাঢ়—মধুরায়ত শরীর সঞ্চিত অলঙ্কার-বাচ্য। তৎসংগত  
 গোধ হইল, বরং তাহাতে আরও মৌলিকপ্রভ: বঞ্চিত হইল।" পূর্বে বাগডটের  
 গদ্যকে যা বলছিলাম, এখানেও সেই নক্ষত্রমালা। আকাশের উপমা।

বন্ধিযের উপক্রমে বহু স্থলে নাটকীয় সংহিত্তি, মানব-চিত্তের বিচিত্র সংঘাত ও  
 চরিত্রিক বৈচিত্র্য উদ্ভাবনের প্রয়োজনে যেমন ইসলামী ইতিহাসে এসে গেছে, তেমন  
 এসেছে ঐশ্বর্য সৃষ্টির চর্চাবার প্রয়াসে। বন্ধিম-সাহিত্যের পদ্ধতিটির এই রূপ-  
 পিণ্ডাসী চেতনার সঙ্গে সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যের পেছনকার রাসমন্ডার প্রভাবের ঘনিষ্ঠ  
 মিল দেখা যায়। রাজসভায় প্রতিপালিত ও বঞ্চিত ব'লে সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যের কল্পনায়  
 রামধনু আঁকা। বন্ধিম সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যের এই গোপন মনটি জানতেন ব'লে মোগল-  
 শাসনের ললিতবিনোদদের লোলাপাঙ্গের স্মৃতিত-চকিত বিদ্যাদ্ব্যমের সঙ্গে সমগ্র ইসলামী  
 ঐশ্বর্যকে বাগত জ্ঞানিয়েছেন তাঁর সাহিত্যে। এ-প্রভাব বড় অন্তরঙ্গ।



আরেকখানি চিত্র—বিষয় ভয়ংকর হ্রস্ব। “নবকুমার কহিলেন, ‘তুমি আমার আগ্রহে কিরিয়া যাও, আমার আশা ত্যাগ কর।’ ‘এজ্ঞয়ে নহে।’ লুৎখ-উল্লিঙ্গা তীরবং পাড়াইয়া উঠিয়া সরপে কহিলেন, ‘এজ্ঞয়ে তোমার আশা ভাঙিব না।’ মন্তক উন্নত করিয়া, ঈষৎ বক্ষিম গ্রীবাভঙ্গি করিয়া রাজরাজমোহিনী পাড়াইলেন। যে অনবনমনীয় গর্গ হৃদয়ান্বিতে গলিয়া গিয়াছিল, আবার তাহার জ্যোতিঃ স্মুরিল; যে অজ্ঞেয় মানসিক শক্তি ভারতরাজ্যশাসন করনায় ভীত হয় নাই, সেই শক্তি আবার প্রণয়ভল দেখে স্ফারিত হইল। ললাটদেশে দমনী সকল ক্ষীত হইয়া রমণীয় রেখা দেখা দিল জ্যোতির্ময় চক্ৰ রবিকরমুখরিত সমুদ্রবারিবে ঝলসিতে লাগিল। নাসারন্ধ্র কাপিতে লাগিল। শোভাবিহারিণী রাষ্ট্রঃসৌ যেমন গতিবিরোধীর প্রতি গ্রীবাভঙ্গি করিয়া পাড়ায়, দলিতফণা ফণিনী যেমন ফণা তুলিয়া পাড়ায়, তেমন উন্মাদিনী খন্দী মন্তক তুলিয়া পাড়াইলেন। কহিলেন, ‘এজ্ঞয়ে না। তুমি আমারই হইবে।’”

মতিবিবির মনে যে-ঈধা, সে-ঈধা যে ভারতীয় চরিত্রে ছিল না, তা নয়, কিন্তু পশ্চিমের জীবনবেদনার রস পান করে সে-ঈধার মুখে গরলের যে-নীলাভ ফেনা ফুট উঠেছে, কালকটের সে-জালা তাঁর ছিল না। আমি যা চাই, তা পাবই, যদি না পাই, তবে ছু হাতে টেনে ছিড়ে ফেলব—কামনার সঙ্গে এমন পৌরুষ-সংকল্পের মিলন, রেনেসাঁদপুর ভারতীয় জীবনচেতনায় ছিল না।

একটি চিত্র মনে পড়ছে। চিত্রখানি ‘কুমারসম্ভবে’র। ব্রহ্মচারীর ছরবেশে শিব তপস্বিনী উমার কাছে এসে শিব যে পতিভাবে কামনার সম্পূর্ণ অযোগ্য, এষ্ট কথা প্রতিপন্ন করবার উদ্দেশ্যেই শিবনিন্দা করছেন। শিবনিন্দা এমন চরমে উঠেছে যে উমা আর সইতে পারছেন না। তখন

ইতি মুখজাতৌ প্রতিরূপবাচিনি

প্রবেশমানাধরলক্ষ্যকোপয়া।

বিকৃতিতল্লভমাহিতে তথা

বিলোচনে তির্ঘণ্তপাশুলোহিতে।

ব্রহ্মচারী এইরূপ প্রতিরূপ কথা বলায় উমার ক্রোদ দেখা দিল, অপর কাপতে লাগল, তল্লভা হুঁকিত হ’লো, নখন দুটি তির্ঘণ্তভাবে নিক্ষিপ্ত হ’তে লাগল এবং তাদের প্রাচ-ভাগ রাসা হ’য়ে উঠল।

আরেকখানি ছবি—শকুন্তলার। ‘শকুন্তলা’ নাটকের পঞ্চম অঙ্কে শকুন্তলা পূর্ব-পরিচয়ের অভিজ্ঞান উল্লেখ করেও যখন ছক্সের মনের গাড়া পেলেন না, বরং উণ্টে

কিন্তু পটুয়ের বিক্রম শুনলেন, তখন সেই স্বভাবময় কৃত্তমকোমল লজ্জাশীলার  
 ঐ দেখা দিল।

ন তিথগবলোকিত\* ভ্রুতি চক্ৰালাতিঃমু  
 পচোতপি পুরুষাক্ষরং ন চ পদেযু সংস্কৃতং।  
 হিমাশু ইব বোপতে সকল এষ বিষ্ণুদরঃ  
 স্বভাববিনতে জনৈঃ যুগপদেব ভেদং গতে ॥

কিন্তু তিথগভাব নেই চোপড়টো ঘন লাল; বাপ্তি রক্ত, শিশিরাহত পে  
 ন খবখর করছে, স্বভাবত বাক্য ক্র একসঙ্গে কৃত্তিত হ'য়ে উঠছে।  
 এ-দৃষ্টি চিত্তের ফলশ্রুতি হ'লো ক্রোধ। এই ক্রোধের জড়ভাবে শকুন্তলা উমাকে  
 ন গেছেন। উমার নয়নচট্টপ পাত্তভাগ রক্তবর্ণ, শকুন্তলার গোটা চোপড়টি  
 । উমার নয়নে তিথক দৃষ্টি, শকুন্তলার দৃষ্টিতে তিথগভাব নেই। উমার চোঁটটা  
 লাবে কাঁপছে, যাতে রাগ হয়েছে বোঝা যা শকুন্তলার গোটা চোঁটটা  
 লাবে খবখর করছে যে রাগা চোঁট মলিন হ'য়ে গেছে। উমার চোঁটটাই  
 ৯, মুখে কথা নেই শকুন্তলার মুখে কথা যেমন কর্কশ, তেমনি তা কোথাও  
 ১০কে না। উমার ক কৃত্তিত হ'লো। শকুন্তলার ভ্রুটো: কঁকড়ে খেন ভেঙে গেল।  
 অজ্ঞাতবের তারতম্য ক্রোধের মাত্রারও তারতম্য বোঝা গেল। একজন  
 ১১ মূলে আছে, যার প্রেমের জন্ম উমা আত্ম তপস্বিনী, তার নিম্নে করা  
 ১২, এইমাত্র। আরেকজনের ক্রোধের মূলে আছে পত্নীত্বের অস্বীকৃতি। শকুন্তলার  
 লগাত অনেক বেশি। কেউ তাকে কখনও এ-রূপে দেখেনি। অজ্ঞাত অস্বীকৃতির  
 ১৩ের জন্ম ক্রোধরূপে তার সমগ্র অন্তরাখ্যার বিশোধজ্ঞাপন। কিন্তু এই দুটি  
 ছিল হ'লো—'কুমারসম্ভবের' "প্রতিকূলবাদিনি" এবং 'শকুন্তলা'র "প্রণয়মপ্রতিপদ-  
 'এই দুটিই 'কপালকুণ্ডলা' উপন্যাসের মতিবিবির মানস-সংস্থিতির মধ্যে আছে।  
 ১৪ মতিবিবির প্রস্তাবের প্রতিকূল কথাই বলেছিলেন এবং তিনি মতিবিবির  
 ১৫ বীকার করতে চাননি। মতিবিবির মানস-সংস্থিতিতেও ক্রোধ। কিন্তু সে-  
 ১৬ চরিত্র ভিন্ন। নিত্য ভোগের চপল আকৃতির মধ্যে যখন প্রেম আবিস্কৃত  
 তখন সেই প্রেম-পিপাসা চরিতার্থ করবার জন্ম মানস-সংস্থিতিতে যোগ দিল  
 ১৭ পরমাত বেপরোয়া মনোভাব। এই মনোভাবের প্রেরণাতেই সে আগ্রার  
 ১৮ চোড়ে এল। যার জন্ম সে সর্বশ ত্যাগ ক'রে ভিগারিনী হ'য়ে এল, সেই  
 ১৯ তার নিম্নতম প্রার্থনা পদদলিত ক'রে চ'লে খেতে চাইল, তখনই তার মধ্যে  
 ২০ দেখা দিল। সেই ক্রোধের মখোই তার জীবনব্যাপী নিকোভ, তার সত্তার বিরোধী

জাগরণ। শকুন্তলার সঙ্গে এই দিক দিয়ে তার সাদৃশ্য ও পার্থক্য। সাদৃশ্য অতিব্যবসার বার্থ প্রতিজ্ঞিয়ায় জীবনান্ত বিস্তোহে। শকুন্তলার পত্নীত্ব স্বীকৃত না-হ'লে তার নারীজীবন বার্থ; মতিবিবির প্রেম স্বীকৃত না-হ'লে মতিবিবি সম্পূর্ণ বার্থ। পার্থক্য হ'লে, শকুন্তলার কান্না ছাড়া গতি ছিল না, মতিবিবির কান্নাটা আশ্রয় হ'য়ে থক'রে জলে উঠল। শকুন্তলা বিজিতা; মতিবিবি বিজয়িনী; শকুন্তলা আত্মসমর্পিতা, মতিবিবি বিস্তোহী। শকুন্তলার প্রিমিত কোমল যোগানে কান্নায় ভেঙে পড়ে, মতিবিবির কোমলের জলন্ত আশ্রয়ের সঙ্গে চরিত্রের ওহাৎ লুকোনো ঝড় এসে সেখানে হাত মিলায়। তাই উভয়ের কোমলের অত্মভাবেও পার্থক্য দেখা দিল। কিন্তু এত পার্থক্য সত্ত্বেও কোমল-প্রবিশেষনের পদ্ধতি প্রাচীন। কেনল নতন মন পুরোনো বোতলে ঢেলে রাখলে খতটুকু নতনের গন্ধ, মতিবিবির অত্মভাবেও সেইটুকু নতনত্ব। এই অত্মভাবেবর জন্ত সেই মস্তক, ঐক্য, চক্ষু, ললাট ও নাসার প্রয়োজন হ'লো। এ-চোখ লাল হ'লো না বটে, তবে "রবিকরমুখরিত সমুদ্রবারিধং"। চোখের দৃষ্টি : "ন তির্ভগবলোকিতম্"—"অনিমেঘ আচ্ছাদ চক্ষু"। জু বেকে কুঞ্চিত হ'লো না বটে কিন্তু ললাট রেহাই পেল না—ঘমনী ক্ষীত হ'লো। রাঙা ঠোট কাঁপতে-কাঁপতে মলিন হ'লো না বটে, কিন্তু নাসারক্ত কাঁপতে লাগল। উমা বা শকুন্তলার কারও বক্ষিম জীব্যভক্তি নেই। মুকাধিনী নয় হ'লে তার প্রয়োজনও ছিল না, কিন্তু দলিত ফণিনীর ডক্টি বিশেষ পরিস্থিতিতে না-পাকলেও 'শকুন্তলা' নাটকে আছে। অতএব দেখা যাচ্ছে, সংগ্রামী প্রতিস্পর্ধাকে বজায় রাখতে গিয়ে বক্ষিমকে পুরোনো অত্মভাবগুলির কিছু সংস্কার সাধন করতে হয়েছে। জীবনমর্শনের নতন প্রাপ্তিও সেই পুরোনো কলাবত্তী রাগিনীতে স্থান ক'রে নিয়েছে।

ব্রাহ্মণবেশীর চিত্র : "আগন্তক ব্রাহ্মণবেশী; সামান্য ধৃতি পরা; গায় উত্তরীয়ে উত্তমরূপে আচ্ছাদিত। ব্রাহ্মণকুমার অতি কোমলবয়স্ক; যুগ্মগলে বয়স্কি কিছুমাত্র নাই। যুগ্মানি পরম স্নন্দর, স্নন্দরী রমণী যুগ্মের দ্বায় স্নন্দর কিন্তু রমণীত্বলভ তেজোগর্ভ-বিশিষ্ট। তাঁহার বেশগুলি সচরাচর পুরুষদিগের বেশের দ্বায় ক্ষৌরকার্যাবশেষাশ্রয় মাত্র নহে, জীলোকদিগের দ্বায় অচ্ছিন্নাবস্থায় উত্তরীয় প্রচ্ছন্ন করিয়া পৃষ্ঠদেশে, অংশে, বাহুদেশে, কদাচিৎ বক্ষে সংস্পর্গিত হইয়া পড়িয়াছে। ললাট প্রশস্ত, ঈষৎ ক্ষীত, মধ্যস্থলে একমাত্র শিরাপ্রকাশশোভিত। চক্ষুদুইটি বিদ্যাত্তমঃপরিসূর্ণ। কোমলশূত্র এক দীর্ঘ তরবারি হস্তে ছিল। কিন্তু এ রূপরাশির মধ্যে এক ভীষণ ভাব ব্যক্ত হইতেছিল।"

এই ভীষণ ভাবের চিত্রের মূলে যে-প্রভাব কাজ করেছে, তা হ'লো 'কাদম্বরী'র প্রতিহারীর। ব্রাহ্মণবেশীর হাতে ছিল কোমলশূত্র এক দীর্ঘ তরবারি 'কাদম্বরী'তে রাজা শূকরের প্রতিহারী : "অনন্যজনবিরুদ্ধেন বামপাখ্যাবলিনা কোকেযকেন সন্নিহিতবিসম্বের

লিঙ্গভাষ্যধর্মমীমাংসাকৃতিঃ।” বহির্ম্ম স্থানান্তরে এষ্ট ভ্রাতৃপুত্রের “ভীমকান্তগুণময়”  
 লয় বর্ণনা বলেছেন। একটি আচরণ করেছেন ‘সুমারসম্ভব’ থেকে। পার্বতী মহাদেবের  
 ঠাই ভীষণ-মধুর রূপের সমন্বয় দেখেছিলেন—“স ভীমরূপঃ শিব উদ্ভূতীর্ঘতে”।

বর্ণনায় বহির্ম্ম যেন সন্তুষ্টকার্যের বিশেষভাবে দেখা গেল।  
 তিনি সন্তুষ্ট কার্যে রূপশিল্পের পরম তরতি কি? যদি  
 পেয়ে থাকেন, তাহলে বুঝতে হবে, যে-প্রভাব তিনি তাঁর নিজের শিল্পকর্মে টেনে  
 তুলেছেন, তা সম্পূর্ণ বাইরের দিক থেকে। তাকে অচরণ বলা যায়, সৃষ্টি  
 । যা না। অচরণ যখন আশ্রিত না হয়ে থাকে তখন তা নিয়ে  
 নতুন সৃষ্টি সম্ভব হয় না। রবীন্দ্রনাথ যা সম্ভব হয়েছিল, বিভিন্ন তা হয়নি,  
 একটি দুঃখের সঙ্গে স্বীকার করেই হয়। রবীন্দ্রনাথ ভারতের প্রাথমিক  
 ধর্ম গোণে অচরণ করতে পেরেছিলেন বলে—ভারতীয় ভীমরূপের সত্যকে আপনার  
 নিজ ধর্মের উপলব্ধিতে নিমজ্জিত করতে পেরেছিলেন বলে—তার সঙ্গে কালিদাসের  
 একান্ত হয়ে ওঠা সম্ভব হয়েছিল, সম্ভব হয়েছিল ভারতীয় শৌন্দর্য-চেতনাকে  
 ধর্ম চিন্তার ধ্যানের দ্বারা ভাসিয়ে দিয়ে একালের নতুন মাস্তুলের নতুন উপলব্ধির  
 ন শৌছে দেওয়া—প্রাচীরের মধ্যে নতুন আশ্রয় স্ফার করা। এমন প্রশ্ন, সে-মহুটি  
 কোথায় তাকে প্রান্যাক্রমে পাওয়া যাবে?

কাব্যশিল্প কখনও নিঃসঙ্গ একক শিল্প নয়। ভারতীয় পার বিচিত্র  
 নাথ একই কালে যে-নাশা শিল্পের অন্বেষণ হয়েছিল, কাব্যশিল্প তাদের অগ্রতম।  
 ই এক ছিলেন, বহু হলেন,—এ-বাণী কেবল উপনিষৎ-সীমার বিশিষ্ট বাণী নয়,  
 ভীম জীবনবোধেরই মূল কথা।

পূর্বে আছে, সৃষ্টির প্রাককালে মহাসমুদ্রের তরঙ্গের উপর নারায়ণের চন্দ্রিত  
 । লক্ষ থেকে যেমন সৃষ্টির উৎসার হয়েছে, তেমনি প্রলয়কালেও নটরাজ শিবের  
 রূপের মধ্যে এই জগৎ বিলীন হ’তে থাকে। যাত্রাক্ষের শিল্পমন্দিরে রক্ষিত  
 নাথের শিল্পমূর্তি দেখে বোঝা যায় প্রাচীন ভারতীয়রা যাত্রা নৃত্যের ছন্দে  
 ভাবে রম্য-মৃত্যুর শৈল্পিক কাহিনী ধারণা করতে পেরেছিল। নৃত্যের সময় মৃত্যুর  
 । নটরাজের বা পা, ডান হাতে আশ্রনের ভিক্ষা, আরেক হাতে বরাহময়।  
 খিট হাসি। নৃত্যের মধ্য দিয়ে তাঁর দেহের শৌন্দর্য-সংলিত তরঙ্গিত মুদ্রা  
 মৃত্যুর নিভাসারার সংকেত হুটে উঠেছে। নৃত্যের মধ্যে আছে তাই একদিকে  
 । তখন, অতলিকে প্রলয়ের চন্দ্র। এই নৃত্য একদিকে যেমন মহুজীবনে,

প্রাণী-জীবনে, অন্তরিক্ত তেমন উদ্ভিদ ও প্রকৃতি-জীবনে। সকলের মধ্যেই এই একই নৃত্য। মাতঙ্গ, পশুপক্ষী, প্রকৃতি—সকলেই এই নৃত্যের সমন্বয়ের মধ্যে ধরা দিয়ে সৃষ্টির তাৎপর্য রক্ষা করতে চায়। মাতঙ্গের অন্তর্জীবন প্রকৃতির অন্তর্জীবনের সঙ্গে এবং মাতঙ্গের বাহ্য জীবন প্রকৃতির বাহ্য জীবনের সঙ্গে সংগতিপূর্ণ। তাই শিল্প-মাঝেই মাতঙ্গ, প্রকৃতি ও পশুপক্ষীর যোগ দেখা যায়। এতে যোগের মধ্যেই সকলের সমন্বয় এবং এই সমন্বয়ের মতোই সৃষ্টির তাৎপর্য। তাই শিল্পীমাত্রই—তিনি নট হোন, চিত্রী হোন, মূর্তিশিল্পী হোন, বা কবি—এই সংগতিটিকে আবিষ্কার করার চেষ্টা করেন।

প্রত্যেকটি শিল্প তার আপন-আপন সাপনায় যেমন নিজের উদ্দেশ্য সম্পর্কে সচেতন, তেমনই সেট উদ্দেশ্যকে সার্থক করে তোলাবার জন্য উদ্দেশ্যভাবার্থী উপাদান সংগ্রহ করেছে, গড়ে নিয়েছে আপন-আপন রূপ প্রকাশের পরিভাষা। তাই পরিভাষার পার্থক্যে প্রত্যেক শিল্পের বিভিন্ন এলাকা। কিন্তু পরিভাষার পার্থক্য সত্ত্বেও সাধনার যে-স্থির আদর্শ, সেখানে সকলেই এক।

সাহিত্যে বিভিন্ন শিল্পের আলোকপাতের ফলে অচসম্বানের পূর্বে সাহিত্যে সংক্রামিত কয়েকটি শিল্পের দৃষ্টান্ত উল্লেখ করি ‘রামায়ণে’ হিরণ্ময়ী সীতা-প্রতিকৃতি; ‘মহাভারতে’ ভীমের আয়সী প্রতিমা; ‘প্রতিমানাটকে’ প্রতিমা-গৃহ; ‘শকুন্তলা’য় মৃত্তিকা-ময়ূর; ‘মুচ্ছকটিকে’ ময়ূর শব্দে ‘মুশুরাকপে’ ধনপট; ‘উত্তররামচরিতে’ আলেখ্যগৃহ; ‘শকুন্তলা’, ‘মালবিকাগ্নিমিত্র’, ‘মালতীমাদন’ ও ‘রত্নাবলী’তে চিত্র এবং ‘মেঘদূতে’ ধাতুরাগে অঙ্কিত গৈরিক চিত্র প্রভৃতি। এছাড়া পাণ্ডুরের রচনায় বাস্তবশিল্পের অসংখ্য উপাদান নানা অলংকারের আশ্রয়ে গাঢ়া দিয়ে আছে। মন্দির-শিল্পের পরিচয় না-ধাকলেও গৃহশিল্পের অহুগ্রহে সমুদ্রগৃহ, মেঘ-প্রতিচ্ছন্দ প্রাসাদ প্রভৃতির অহুপরিহিত নেই।

সংকৃত্ত সাহিত্যে যে-সকল আগন্তুক শিল্প ব্যক্তিগত কৃমিকায় অবতীর্ণ, তাদের অন্ততম নৃত্যশিল্প—যে-নৃত্যশিল্প বিশ্ব-নৃত্যের অঙ্গীভূত হয়ে নমনীয় (প্রান্তিক) শিল্প ও চিত্র-শিল্পের মূলনীতির সংবাদক। ‘কুমারসম্ভবে’ আমরা পার্বতীকে প্রথম দেখলাম হিমালয়ের ঘরে। তারপর তাকে অনেকবার দেখেছি, কিন্তু তাকে পুরোপুরি দেখলাম যখন সে কেবল প্রকৃতির সঙ্গে একাত্ম হ’য়েই যে দেখা দিল, তা নয়, যখন সে

আবর্তিতা কিকিদিব স্তন্যভ্যাম্

বাসো বসানো তরুণার্কাগম্।

পর্ণাপ্পপুস্তবকাবনম্রা

• সকারিনী পল্লবিনী লতেব।

পার্বতী এখানে সম্পূর্ণ লতা হয়ে উঠেছে। তার নুকে পথের পুষ্পের স্তবক, পরনে  
 তল ঘূর্ণের রক্তিম আভার মত রাঙা বসন। অকণ্ঠের মারুজ রশ্মিছটায় প্রকৃতি-  
 ক্রমের গ্রাণপ্রাচুর্যে সজোড়াগ্রন্থ পুষ্পিত লতাটি যে সেইখানেই তার শেষ নয়।  
 বহুদূর সে 'সকারিনী' না-হ'তে পারছে, ততক্ষণ তার পূর্ণ প্রকাশ নেই। মাছঘের  
 জীবনের নৃত্যছন্দ প্রকৃতির নৃত্যছন্দে শোষিত হয়ে যৌবনের পূর্ণছন্দে প্রকাশিত।  
 আর পাঠকের অবচেতনে গাথত নৃত্যচন্দ্রের অণুভবের ভেগে উঠল এক  
 অদিগ্ধচন্দ্রীয় সৌন্দর্য-সংবেদনা। এখানে প্রকৃতির জীবন পার্শ্বীয় জীবন একান্ত  
 হয়ে উঠেছে; পার্বতী মিলিয়ে যায় লতায়, লতা মিলিয়ে যায় পার্বতীতে এবং  
 প্রকৃতির জীবনধারা ও মানব-জীবনধারা পরস্পর পরস্পরের পরিসর্য না-হ'য়ে বিখ-  
 জীবনের আদি নৃত্যছন্দে সমন্বিত হয়ে উঠেছে আর যা আছে,  
 হ'লো শিল্পীর ব্যক্তিত্ব। একটি বিশেষ প্রয়োজনীয় মুহূর্তে একটি বিশেষ মানসতায়  
 পার্বতী যে যৌবনে পদার্পণ করেছে, তা পাঠকের ক'রে তুলেলে কবি।  
 লক্ষ্যলাকে দেখি

অধর: কিসলয়রাগ: কোমলবিটপাচকারিতো  
 কুহুমিবি লোভনীয়: যৌবনমেষু মধুহন:।

লক্ষ্যলা যেন প্রকৃতির মধ্য থেকে বিখ-প্রাণে। লোঙ্কায় মাছঘী তুল নিয়ে বেরিয়ে  
 এল। তখনও সে যেন প্রকৃতির প্রতিমিমা গুলবিশেষ: তা বাহ্যতে বিটপের  
 জাল, পুষ্প তার লাবণ্য ভ'রে দিল অশ্রু-অশ্রু প্রবাহিত যৌবন-প্রস্রোতে, কিসলয় দিল  
 তার রক্তিম ছটা আঁর্জি অধরের কল ছাপিয়ে তারপর গুললতার সঙ্গে শকুন্তলার  
 লাবত সৌহার্দ্য, বিজ্ঞ সহোদরত্ব ঘনিড়ে আনলেন কবি। কিন্তু ভ্রমর যখন তাকে  
 ডাকা ক'রে এল,

চলাপালাং দৃষ্টি: স্পৃগসি বহুধা বেদপদমতী:  
 রহস্তাখ্যাহীং যনসি মুহু: কণাশ্চিকচর:।

রবাব ছলিয়ে স্থান হ'তে স্থানান্তরে গতিসফারে শকুন্তলার যখন নৃত্যছন্দ ভেগে  
 উঠল, তখনই দৃষ্টি মুগ্ধ হলেন, প্রেমে পড়লেন। শকুন্তলার যৌবনকে কবি নৃত্যছন্দের  
 আধাত দিয়ে ব্যক্ত ক'রে নীলাদ্রিত ক'রে তুলে। অপরূপে, করণে, রেচকে যেন  
 যৌবনের প্রাণধর্ম উপছে পড়ল প্রকৃতি, পশুপক্ষী ও মাছঘের মধুর মিলনের মানবিক

আত্মিতা। শকুন্তলা তখন প্রাণের উজ্জল লাবণ্যের প্রতীক—যে-প্রাণ প্রকৃতি ও পশুপক্ষীর প্রাণধর্মের রাশিবিজ্ঞানে, মানবীয় মৈত্রীতে বাধা। সীমাহীন প্রাণশ্রোতের অনন্ত উজ্জ্বল আবিষ্কৃত হ'লো শকুন্তলার নন্দিত যৌবনের তরঙ্গিত ছন্দে। প্রেমের পঙ্কলে দ্রুত। অনন্য, প্রিয়বদা ও শকুন্তলার রূপ-যৌবনের সমতা থাকলেও শকুন্তলার যে-স্বযোগ ছিল, অল্প দুই সখীর তা ছিল না-ব'লে তারা দুজনের চোখে পড়ল না। 'শকুন্তলা'র প্রথম অঙ্কে কালিদাস নানাভাবে নানাদিক থেকে তপোবনের পরিবেশকে পাঠক-মনে ঘনিষ্ঠে তুলেছিলেন। ভৃগুশ্বরের চিত্রে তপোবনের যে-সামগ্রিক পরিবেশ বিদ্যুত, প্রথম অঙ্কে তার প্রয়োজন ছিল না; ছিল না এই ভ্রত যে শকুন্তলা স্বয়ং সেখানে উপস্থিত হ'য়ে প্রকৃতির সঙ্গে তার আত্মগা নৌহাঙ্গ ব্যক্ত করতে বাত। যুগ ও পক্ষীদের সঙ্গে শকুন্তলার নাড়ির যোগ আমরা তখনই বুঝলাম পতিগৃহবাসী তপোবনের নাড়িতে স্বয়ং টান পড়ল। বৃক্ষগুলিও তখন পিছনে পড়ে থাকল না; সম্মিলিত তপোবন-তরঙ্গা দিলেন অমৃতি তরঙ্গ বৃক্ষের।

কৌমঃ কেনচিসিন্দুপাত্ত তরুণা দাক্ষ্যাবিষ্কৃতঃ  
নিষ্ঠাতন্ত্রণোপরাগতভগো লা-বসঃ কেনচিৎ।  
অন্তোভ্যো বনদেবতাকরতলৈরাপপ্ৰভাগোখিতৈ  
দন্তজাতরগানি নক্ষিসলয়োদেদ প্রতিবর্জিতঃ।

শকুন্তলা প্রকৃতি, পশুপক্ষীর সঙ্গে একাত্ম হ'য়েও মানবী র'য়ে গেল। প্রকৃতিভ্রমণ, পশুভ্রমণ শকুন্তলার প্রাধান্য দুটিয়ে তোলবার ভ্রত গৌণ হ'য়ে রইল। তারা তাকে রূপ দিল, লাবণ্য দিল, প্রাণ দিল—যে-প্রাণ বিশ্ব-প্রাণের সঙ্গে এক হ'য়ে গাঁথা। তাই লতার সঙ্গে পুষ্পের যে-সম্পর্ক, শকুন্তলার সঙ্গে তপোবন-প্রকৃতির সেই সম্পর্ক। আমরা শকুন্তলাকে বিশ্ব-প্রাণের যোগে একই দেখতে পেলাম।

কালিদাসের 'শকুন্তলা'য় মাহুয ও পশুপক্ষী নিয়ে প্রকৃতির যে-চিত্র দেখলাম, নমনীয় শিল্পে এরূপ চিত্রের অভাব নেই। কেবল মাহুযের স্থানটি দেবতা এলি কেড়ে নিয়েছেন। এমন সাদৃশ্য থাকা সবেও তুলনামূলক পরীক্ষায় এরূপ সিদ্ধান্ত করতে বাধ্য নেই যে কাব্যের বাহ্যে পাঠ্যে বিশ্ব-প্রাণের যে-মানসপ্রত্যক্ষ ঘটে, জীবন দিয়ে জীবন জাগানোর ফলে যে-অনির্বচনীয় রস ভাগে, কাব্যোত্তর কোনো শিল্পে তা সম্ভব নয়। সম্ভব নয় কেননা শব্দ-শক্তির যে-তাপ, সে-তাপ আর কোনো শিল্প-উপাদানের নেই। কাব্যশিল্পের অননুভবনীয় উৎকর্ষের চাপে প্রতিবেশী শিল্পগুলি যে গৌণ হ'য়ে রয়েছে, প্রশংসাক্রমে এই সত্যটিরও সন্ধান পাওয়া গেল। বহু প্রাচীনকাল

আখ্যায়ের বেশে নানা শিল্পের যুগপৎ অঙ্কনীন চলচে, তবে জাতীয় দ্বিতীয় থেকে অষ্টম শতাব্দী পর্যন্ত অঙ্কনীন যে জোরদার হয়েছে, তার স্বাক্ষর হ'লো শিল্পী। 'অগ্নিপূরাণ', 'মৎস্যপূরাণ', 'বৃহৎসংহিতা', 'মহাশক্তি', 'ভৃকুনীতিসার', 'বিজ্ঞানবোত্তর', 'শিল্পশাস্ত্র', 'মানসাব', 'তত্ত্বসার' প্রভৃতি গ্রন্থ ভারতীয় মনীষার মনন-ভঙ্ককে ধরে রেখেছে।

যদিও সংস্কৃত প্রভাবের মৌল রশ্মি উপলব্ধি করতে পেরেছেন কিনা তা পৃথক্বেষণের দ্বারা কবির প্রতিবেদী শিল্পের সাধা ও সাধনের খ্যাসম্ভব আলোচনা করলাম। শিল্পের করলাম যে কাব্যশিল্প প্রয়োজনবোধে অজ্ঞাত শিল্প গ্রাস করে তুরীয় হয়েছে। এখন 'কপালকুণ্ডলা' ও 'শকুন্তলা' পাশাপাশি রেখে খাচাই করে দেখলে তার অহমানের স্বার্থ মূল্য লোকা যাবে।

'কপালকুণ্ডলা'য় কপালকুণ্ডলা যেমন মাহুয়, 'শকুন্তলা'য় শকুন্তলা ঠিক তেমনটি মাহুয় মাহুতলার পিতা ক্ষয়ি, মাতা অপরা; কপালকুণ্ডলা মাহুতপরিচয়হীন খাটি মিলে মাহুয়। শকুন্তলার সঙ্গে তপোবন-প্রকৃতির যে-আয়িক সম্পর্ক, বিশ্ব-প্রাণের মিল, কপালকুণ্ডলার সঙ্গে সাগরমেখলা অরব্যাসকুল কাপালিকের আশ্রয়ের সে-যোগ লাগরকুলে সন্ধ্যাকালে অরব্যাসকুল তটে কপালকুণ্ডলার সঙ্গে নবকুমারের আকস্মিক মৈত্র্যযোগে। নবকুমার এর পূর্বে কখনও আসেননি, আসবার কোনো স্বরূপ নেই। কপূর তপোবনে দৃষ্টিস্তের আগমন অপ্রত্যাশিত হ'লেও আসবার স্বরূপ হ'লো। এক তখনকার দিনে তপোবনের সঙ্গে ক্ষয়ি রাজার যে-সম্পর্ক ছিল তাতে মাঝে-মাঝে তপোবন পরিদর্শন অপ্রত্যাশিত নয়। 'কপালকুণ্ডলা'য় পারম্পরিক দর্শনে নবকুমার হলেন এবং সে-মোহের কারণ প্রাকৃতিক মাহাস্বাভাবিত বিশ্বহতাব। নবকুমার হলেন বটে কিন্তু কপালকুণ্ডলা মুগ্ধ হ'লো এমন প্রমাণ নেই। শি শাস্ত্রে থাকে 'মদ' বলে, এ যেন তাই। এ মোহ, এ প্রেম, এ একতরফা ভালবাসা। সংস্কৃত মাহু অহুয়ারে উভয়ের মধ্যে সমান রতি ছাগলেই তবে তা শৃঙ্গারের অহুতল। পূর্বেই বলেছি কপালকুণ্ডলা মানবী, সন্ধ্যাকালে সাগরকুলের ছায়ায় গাভীর্ষ কুণ্ডলার তারুণ্যের উপর বিশ্বাসের রহস্য তেলে দিয়েছে। 'শকুন্তলা'য় শকুন্তলার উপভোগক্ষম হ'য়ে অস্তুর-অস্তুরে বহুপল্লবগুলি সহকারের দ্বায় একজন তরুণের জ্ঞান করছিল। সখীদের হাসি-ঠাট্টায়, প্রকৃতির রোমাঞ্চিকতায় দৃষ্টিস্তের গভীরাকৃতি য়ে যে সে মুগ্ধ হ'লো, প্রেমে পড়ল; দৃষ্টিস্ত প্রেমে পড়লেন তপোবন-প্রকৃতির রোমাঞ্চিক পরিবেশে, দৈহিক সৌন্দর্যের মোহাক্ষরিতায়। কপালকুণ্ডলা হুমুরী; হুমে জারিত তার সৌন্দর্য। শকুন্তলা হুমুরী; রক্তমাংসের সৌন্দর্য গেরিয়ে প্রাকৃতিক রোশোখিত হ'য়ে অতীন্দ্রিয় প্রাতিভর্শনের দ্বারা মৃত তার অনির্ভরীয় সৌন্দর্য।



কাপালিকের আশ্রম-প্রকৃতির সঙ্গে কপালকুণ্ডলার কোনো জৈব সম্পর্ক নেই, নেই কাপালিকের আশ্রম পেরিয়ে বিশ্ব-প্রকৃতির সঙ্গে তার প্রাণের বন্ধন। কাপালিকের আশ্রম ছেড়ে বাবার সময় কোথাও কোনো টান পড়ল না,—না কপালকুণ্ডলার জীবনে, না কাপালিকের আশ্রমে। শকুন্তলার পতিগৃহযাত্রায় নিপিল বিশ্ব একদিকে যেমন সহকার বনজ্যোৎস্নার স্নেহ, যুগকূল, পক্ষিকূল ও তপোবনবাসীদের সহজ প্রেম নিয়ে উদকান্ত পর্বত অহুসরণ করেছে, তেমনি বিচ্ছেদের বেদনায় মত্ত হ'য়ে মানবিক স্তরে উঠেছে। শকুন্তলার প্রেম বধন আত্মমুখী ছিল, তখন তাকে বিশ্বমুখী করবার জন্ত নেমে এল ছর্বাসার অভিলাষ। অভিলাষের ছদ্মবেশে প্রত্যাখ্যানের বেদনায় যে-হোমানল জ্বালা হ'লো, তাতে শোধিত হ'লো। ইন্দ্রিয়ঙ্গ প্রেম; জাগল চুচিমিত্ত পবিত্র প্রেম। শূন্যের উদ্বোধনে যেমন পারম্পরিক রতি, শোধনেও তেমনি দৃষ্টি ক্ষয়যে সমকালীন অরিসংযোগ। প্রাপোঙ্কাসে কলমুখরিত কণের আশ্রম রূপান্তরিত হ'লো শাস্তরসাম্পদ মারীচাজ্যে; চাকলা রূপ পেল হিরতায়। 'কপালকুণ্ডল'য় নবকুমারের প্রেম চটুল, চকল। একটু ধাক্কা খেলে নিজেই নিজের সবনাশ ভেঙে আনে। কপালকুণ্ডলার প্রেম নেই, সহায়কৃতি আছে। নবকুমারের সংসারে সে বিদেশিনী, প্রবাদবাসের পর সে ফিরল না স্বগৃহে। দেবতার আত্মানে ও সংসারের সঙ্গে নিজেকে খাপ খাওয়াতে না-পেরে যুত্মর পথ বেছে নিল। শকুন্তলার যাত্রা এক তপোবন থেকে আরেক তপোবনে; কপালকুণ্ডলার যাত্রা কাপালিকের আশ্রম থেকে আশানের পথে।

একথা সত্য যে 'শকুন্তল' নাটকের উৎসাহ পেয়ে বহিম 'কপালকুণ্ডলা' রচনা করেছেন এবং 'কপালকুণ্ডলা' রচনায় ভারতীয় সাহিত্য-সংস্কৃতির প্রবহমান ধারাকেই তাঁর নবচেতনায় উপলব্ধ সাহিত্যিক অভীপ্সা পরিবেশনের পাত্র ক'রে নিয়েছেন। রূপকর্মে গ্রহণ করেছেন সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যের রূপাদর্শকে। সংস্কৃত সাহিত্যের সঙ্গে যোগ রেখে এবং পাকাতা সাহিত্যের নূতন চেতনায় অঙ্গপ্রাণিত হ'য়ে তিনি যা সৃষ্টি করলেন, তাতে মনে হয়, সংস্কৃত সাহিত্য-শিল্পের মৌল রহস্তটি উপলব্ধি করবার চেষ্টা তিনি করেননি। অস্বস্ত সংস্কৃত শিল্প-ভারতের সঙ্গে তাঁর চিন্তের যোগাযোগ ছিল না। তাই প্রাচীন শিল্পাদর্শ দিয়ে তিনি নূতন চেতনায় যা সৃষ্টি করলেন, তা প্রাচীনের নূতন রূপ নয়, প্রাচীনের অঙ্ককরণ।

EURIPIDES AND THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE TRAGIC FORM :  
A STUDY OF *IPHIGENIA IN AULIS*

An approach to classical tragedy has to be defined first. Either we regard the tragic matter as a fictional transcript of actual existence; or regard it as free from the relations, concerns and values of normal existence and embracing the modalities of a primitive way of existence rooted in ritual and myth.<sup>1</sup> Family relationships, for example, could not be interpreted as in a novel, in purely domestic or social terms. In the tragedy of Aischylos and Sophokles they would derive their significance from the fact that they involved mythical and ritual values, commitments and extensions. It is no longer necessary or even possible to accept the Murray-Harrison interpretation of the form and content of classical tragedy.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, unless we are prepared to recognize the mythical core of the tragic matter we shall not really understand in what specific regard antique tragedy differs from other literary genres of classical antiquity, from later tragedy, or even from the tragedy of Euripides. In what terms, at what level, the human relations are conceived is the basic question. And we shall see that Euripides, as opposed to Aischylos and Sophokles, is concerned with a modality of existence that can only be defined as secular, but that in the latter these are mythical, that is, sacred.<sup>3</sup> So that, with them, tragedy is an embodiment of an archaic interpretation of existence, in which it is conceived of in sacral terms involving a polarized relationship between men and gods. Although it is usually maintained that Sophoklean drama is anthropocentric, the primary concern of both Aischylos and Sophokles is to explore the complex and baffling problem of human existence and its values, and the humanity-divinity relationship provides the focus of the action. In Euripides the gods exist in order to satisfy the convention of popular

language or as symbols of otherworldly psychological forces.

Developed Greek tragedy is the myth which has been transformed on a large scale and sublimated. This is what invariably happens to the primal myth through its interaction with the material and ideological complexities that arise in an advanced social formation. But the abstract theological and ethical values of the Aeschylean-Sophoclean plays do not conceal or disguise the primitive quality of the core of the action, the theme: a deed of monstrous crime involving a pollution, a miasma, which possesses an intensity of dread and desperation beyond the ethical or the juridical.<sup>4</sup> The guilt is quite independent of the motive of the doer and pursues him even if he does it in ignorance or in obedience to a god's behest. This crime invariably involves blood guilt or violation of kinship ties.<sup>5</sup> Although it comes to be invested with purely moral horror, which intensifies an already unbearable agony, it still retains as its basic feature its original, mythical quality of infringement of taboo,<sup>6</sup> a purely ritual pollution of sanctity, which can only be expiated by means of a fearful sacrifice. And this pollution is what Aristotle quite possibly meant by *megale hamartia* without being quite aware of its mythical sense and reality. Pollution,<sup>7</sup> violation of taboo, leading to the protagonist's excommunication attended with some sort of sacrifice—even the performance of some sort of vestigial slaughter of the guilty one: this is the pattern of action of one of the greatest of classical tragedies, the *Oedipus Tyrannos*, and appears in some form or other in all pre-Euripidean tragedy. As in primitive society, the nature of the guilt would not depend on the quality or content of the motive but on the deed itself. The concept is essentially non-religious and non-ethical but is capable of immense and multivalent enrichment through the incorporation of the values on which a developed social order is based.

The OT gives the basic pattern, the basic constituents, of the mythical tragic view of human existence (as opposed to the Euripidean, secular) as one pervaded by fear and anxiety lest one commit an unescapable, foreknown pollution; one commits this nevertheless, in spite of one's most anxiously and carefully contrived attempts to escape it, and then pays for it in a vestigial self-sacrifice. The protagonist is pursued by the oracle not like a malignant destiny but as the law, the very condition of his existence. Spiritually blind before the physical self-blinding, he does not realize that he is already polluted, even when this is exposed by the seer.<sup>8</sup>

essential features of this scheme are to be discovered in all pre-tragedy, although the details would vary considerably. What grasped first of all is that this tragedy is mythical, symbolic, and that the superficiality of this is responsible for the extremely superficiality which ancient tragedy has been generally subjected. Secondly, the symbolism refers to a reality which is not to be understood in terms of contemporary frustrations or aspirations. The Prometheus of Euripides has nothing to do with the Prometheus of Hölderlin or Shelley, nor does the Prometheus of Sophokles with the Oidipus of Cocteau. Since this tragedy is neither allegorical nor symbolic in any modern sense, it will require a great effort on our part to transfer ourselves to that mode of perception through which alone we can realize as much of its significance as it is possible to recover today. This tragedy does not deal with the whole of the mythical moment,<sup>9</sup> the moment between the deed and the punishment, the crime and the punishment, the moment which is outside of time, therefore petrified and eternized in a symbol, a myth. We can find in this the character of tragic time in Shakespeare as well, who was only a tragedian after Aischylos and Sophokles to recover the mythical tragedy. The deed followed by the sacrifice: this is the underlying purpose of the protagonist's inner and outer existence. He is not a 'character' in any modern sense, a figure with a number of complexly connected attributes, whose conflicting attributes lead to one interesting psychological situation after another, complicated events. Having no feeling, no gesture, no impulse out of the mythical moment of his existence, he is a figure of simplicity and motivation, massive, heroic, raging and storming to the end dissolved in sentiment, the anti-heroic mood.<sup>10</sup> The transition from the heroic to the sentimental and anti-heroic is a feature of the 'tragic hero', of Oidipus, Prometheus, Macbeth, and is to be found in the character of Homer's Achilles and in the conception of the *Iliad*

'tragic hero' is primitive. Not, however, in the sense that he is a primitive man, but in the sense that he is a man who is not what are called 'primitive passions' (as if they do not exist in civilized men) but in the literary sense of being undervived from the past, for they are themselves partially the prototypes of figures that appear in later tragedy. Partially; because Euripides' influence on the Aischylean-Sophoklean inheritance through the determination of tragedy that it effected from the mythical roots and the equally thorough-going secularization at all levels. The

Aeschylean-Sophoclean figures are individuated with strongly marked features but how different these are from what are called psychological qualities! They possess no inner life, with impulses whose demands conflict with and contradict one another, so that, immobilized by an interesting inner paralysis of thought or feeling. Or, if they decide on a course of action, the steps they can bring themselves to take are not decisive enough but halty, disjointed, hesitant, "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought"—in short, the image of Hamlet put into circulation by Coleridge and haunting the modern imagination ever since. Governed by half-realized motives of love, ambition, revenge, hatred, jealousy, whether they meet success or failure depends not so much on the nature of objective human existence as on the inner personal qualities they bring to their encounter with it. Almost invariably these qualities produce a deadlock through their own contradictions. This is the course that the development of modern subjective literature has taken, in which life consists in a certain quality and not in a deed, its presentation in a certain mode of analysis and not in a certain symbol whose validating referent is a supernatural order. Although this description would apply no more than partially to Euripides, we cannot deny that 'character' in the modern sense is foreshadowed in such a figure as Agamemnon in the *Iphigenia*.<sup>12</sup> He is distinguished by many of the characteristics indicated above. The purpose of this play as of many others by Euripides is no more than to provide 'superior amusement' and not to present through image and symbol, a ritual enactment of pain, guilt and sacrifice.<sup>13</sup> The Aeschylean-Sophoclean plays are not therefore primarily to be judged by entertainment values (dull, interesting, bright, etc.), for their ritual foundations determine the content of their imagery, their structure, the feelings they communicate, and the characters. A communally kathartic function is realized by them, and the audience would be involved intensely in the play's issue. But this would be intensity of a different kind from say, our involvement in the action of *Miss Julia*. The effect of this play is surely shattering to the nerves and we are filled with awe and agony if not pity, but there is no katharsis in the classical sense.

The chorus, which is for Euripides obviously a cumbersome convention,—he made excellent use of it, though, by turning it into brilliant decor—is in earlier drama so completely identified with the fortunes of the action (not, it is to be marked, with those of the 'heroes') that it completely shuts in the action from the spectators and enacts the ritual of pain and death and purification together with the protagonists. Far from

being the 'idealized spectators' of their fortunes,<sup>14</sup> it is invariably connected with them through a kinship or political (i.e. vestigially tribal) tie. It is committed to the process and the issue of the action in the most vital way. It therefore guides the action when it can and judges it always, as the mouthpiece of ancestral tradition: it is no accident that in some of the most violent of the actions the chorus is composed of presbytes.

This is how we must look upon the chorus and not as, in its original purpose, a dramatic convention at all. To be sure, it tended to become that as the drama increasingly and inevitably deviated from the ritual motivation and the beginning of this disaster is to be seen in Sophokles. On the whole, however, the classical tragic structure is impossible without the chorus, without it as the instigator, accomplice or judge, the deed would be only an individual crime, the work of a criminal or misguided person, who thereby exposes himself to his own remorse or to juridical action, but not to ritual isolation and excommunication, involving the terrifying punishment of the communal curse. Detached, in the sense of possessing practically no personal feeling of love or hatred for the protagonists, the chorus is yet passionately engaged in its concern for the ritual and political significance of the deed, disregarding whether it is done in ignorance or in knowledge and with whatever motive. The man of crime is at the same time a basic functionary of the communal order, a successful culture hero, a king, a liberator, a founder of the order. And all the significance of his existence and action would evaporate without the chorus to embody, articulate and also to transmit it, with the most vivid emotional force. Such a function is not to be discharged through any sort of personal relationship with the main actors.

In most modern drama, the major complications are set in motion by individual or social problems of adjustment springing from the passion of love; naturally, because in a secular society the relation between the sexes determines the structure of the most elementary unit, the family, whose inherited structure, constantly threatened by the invasion of new forces as constantly demands re-definition. Love does not exist as a tragic motive before Euripides, although in Sophokles it has begun to make an intrusion. The significance of its introduction as a major factor in the action by Euripides cannot be dealt with here as fully as it should be. The static, almost rigid presence of the chorus throughout the action, overseeing, inciting, praising, condemning every movement of the protagonists, symbolizes a social formation in which the inherited family

and social structure must be maintained at all costs; the whole apparatus of taboo, scapegoat and sacrifice is contrived for its protection.

As the basic relations in Aeschylean-Sophoclean drama are those of family and polis, connected with father-child, mother-son, husband-wife, king-polis, and as the tragic deed consists in the violation of these relations, so the basic emotions are fear, anxiety, anticipation, foreboding, all connected with pollution. The basic human feelings are ignored (for example, family affections) unless they receive a ritual extension and deepening.

The upper and the lower gods—and especially the latter—are a constantly looming menace and the protagonist has sooner or later to settle accounts with them. Aeschylos and Sophokles have, not an attitude to the gods, but an attitude to the relationship between men and gods. It will not certainly do to say that they show a primitive attitude, for the President of the Immortals has already turned into a President of the ethical order which is inchoate or inarticulate in the primitive ideology. Since however their main function in the tragedies is to punish violation of the inherited sanctities (not, be it noted, the only function), we must recognize the lively survival of the primitive tradition in the conception. This is not the place to discuss the tragedians' conceptions of the gods or to work out the differences, from the point of view of the primitive tradition, of the Aeschylean and Sophoclean conceptions from Euripides'. But we may briefly note the replacement of the mythical view of the gods by the secular view in the development of sculpture also. It is obvious that now worship is offered as a routine and that the sacredness of the gods' statues is being increasingly sacrificed, increasingly subordinated to aesthetic consideration. Even in the classical period the artists are motivated by a conception of the gods which is more 'poetic' than mythical;<sup>15</sup> Praxiteles in the fourth century B.C. shows the gods turning into art products with purely sensuous features. Anecdotes crop up relating how passionate human feelings, having nothing to do with the religious emotions of holiness and fear, were excited by these statues among their beholders, especially among the more youthful. The whole process is seen very clearly in the evolution of the figure of Aphrodite from the early period to the Knidian Aphrodite to the Venus of Milo.<sup>16</sup> More and more clearly the goddess emerges as a symbol of sensual love. Her primitive association with fertility has disappeared in Praxiteles, and the process becomes complete with the grouping of Venus and Eros,<sup>17</sup> which does not appear in classical

sculpture. Thus the development of tragedy from Aischylos to Euripides reflects a transformation of consciousness, which is repeated in the development of sculpture (and in that of music as well<sup>16</sup>). This transformation must be connected with the emergence of the secular understanding of human problems introduced by the sophists, probably the first to formulate them as such.

Such a view is certainly confirmed by the fact that in the fourth century B.C. and thereafter, when classical tragedy decayed utterly and the 'stage' came to be born in the modern sense—that it was only then that Euripides came to be honoured with the crown which his own age had denied him. It is certainly no accident that his surviving plays—at least eighteen—outnumber those of the other two playwrights together.

That art with multi-level significance can only be sustained by collective emotion attached to a broadly accepted religious view of existence is a commonly held position now-a-days. This does not have to be altogether true of the novel, which is meant for reading alone. But the great periods of the spectacular arts, among which drama no less than architecture, painting and sculpture would be included, have been also religious periods, and this is certainly not to be dismissed as fortuitous.

Modern writers realize this and many of them have tried to interpret contemporary existence either in terms of Christianity or in those of a restored ancient myth. Artists in other spheres have not followed suit however, except exceptionally. This isolation of the writers proves how hopeless from the beginning their attempt was. Even the most moving of their works have not succeeded in escaping the analytical subjectiveness of modern art, whose characteristic is the rejection of action as the essence of life.

Perhaps it will not be conceded that with the advance of secularism there occurs a general degeneration of art and literature. But the admission that these thereby lose the position they once held as a focus and centre of apprehensible significance at all social levels; that increasingly the effective content as well as the form is individualized, giving larger and larger scope to charlatanry at worst and eccentricism at best, so that, in a short time, art at popular levels is degraded and vulgarized, while in the higher levels it is turned into art for the few initiated—this admission will, it is hoped, be readily made. This at least was the fate that overtook Greek literature after the classical period. If Roman literature and culture never knew any phase comparable to the classical Greek, this



must be attributed to the artificialization of Roman religion and the divorce of its urban form from popular roots petrified into frigid rituals by an overbearing hierarchy. Greek religion up to the middle of the fifth century B.C. had deeply rooted foundations in collective emotion which expressed itself in various modes. But, by the time civilization was advanced enough for Rome to have an original literature and culture, religion at the upper stratum was a matter of rigid official organization, and what went on in the lower was largely disdained by the 'cultured' circles. This may be one of the reasons why the tragic period in Roman literature does not belong to the so-called golden but to the silver age and why its mood is one of unheroic despair reflected in Stoicism. And this mood increasingly overtakes English tragedy also (whose culminating period vividly recalls the Greek classical period in all the essential details); the comparison of Euripides and Beaumont and Fletcher, darlings of the Restoration Age, would not be quite fanciful.

Nineteenth century German criticism of Greek tragedy from Schlegel to Nietzsche to Mommsen, beginning with Schlegel, made a radical departure from the tradition of Euripidean criticism since the Revival of Letters. The latter was more or less a reformulation of the attitude to this dramatist since the fourth century B.C. when his popularity began to surpass that of Aischylos and Sophokles. German criticism did arrive at a correct formulation of the difference between Euripides and his predecessors and also at a correct assessment of their merits. In spite of the strong protest of Goethe, this attitude persisted until Verrall. His rationalist and realist Euripides launched, in play after play, the most devastating attacks on popular mythology and theology, but disguising them so carefully that the real motivation was not discovered until thousands of years later. Although Verrall's theory was not generally accepted in the extreme form in which he stated it, its influence can be felt in most twentieth century criticism. The widely accepted view of Euripides as the 'realist', who brings down mythology and its figures to the human level and shows in the delineation of the figures psychological realism of the most penetrating kind, is apparently hard to refute. Murray, whose admiration for Euripides is unbounded, compares him with Ibsen.<sup>14</sup> Similarly the *Hippolytos* has been praised for the depth and truth of its treatment of abnormal passion. It is not the intention of these pages to contest this view. The thesis here is that the passionate involvement of Euripides in the human situation as such, that is, without reference to the area of sanctity which presides over the action in Aischylos and

Thus, this involvement dissolved the form of tragedy and led, by which can be precisely marked, to a type of dramatic form which is accustomed to describe as tragi-comedy. At the point of origin, tragi-comedy is a passionate involvement in the human situation involved in secular terms. The work of Euripides from beginning shows more or less a clear pattern; the *Iphigenia in Aulis* is not an achievement to the *Hippolytos*, say, but was an inevitable consequence of it. A new thing is born—art in the aesthetic sense; an object of art, not of direct experience because it uses the data of human life as such for other purposes than to evoke metaphysical terror. To repeat what was said much earlier, the transformation, if we like, but it is better to describe it as secularization, is going on *pari passu*, with a number of other changes at other levels; the last two or three decades of the fifth century B.C. are the basic periods in the history of European consciousness.

*Iphigenia in Aulis* should be regarded as 'artistically' a serious play. Structurally nor in content does the play show any relaxation of seriousness. All the same a sense of fundamental irresponsibility pervades this antiquarian tragedy, the sense that the play's fortunes matter in any vital way, that we are faced with figures drawn neither from human life as such nor from genuine mythology but that material from either source is used indifferently to construct a story, an extremely good story, which is beautifully presented. And the construction is a serious artifice. Coming as it does at the end of the dramatist's life, it represents a mature achievement as mature as the *Bacchae* must be explored as such. It was one of the few Greek plays with which Western Europe was familiar from the Revival of Letters until the middle of the eighteenth century.

The corruption of the text, particularly of the end, does not matter very much in this connection. The interest lies entirely in the fact that the play is not more or less an aberration, and that the so-called defects of the play are not really defects but features that spring from that deeper and broader disintegration which has been indicated above. Here they are noted in the total discarding of mythology which overtakes any epoch at a certain stage of its development. In this particular case

it is a symptom of the dissolution of the culture and civilization of the polis which, brought to maturity by one general war, is speeded to its decline by another.

The tragic form disintegrates because the non-historical, non-chronological mythical and sacral moment, stretching from the doing of the deed, the pollution, to the expiation, is converted into measurable time whose passage has specific phases distinguished by *unexpected* events. Instead of anticipation and cosmic despair we have scheming and the consternation that follows its frustration by *chance*. In the deployment of these events the sense of chronological succession has to be—and has been—most carefully established, so that the mythical coherence of earlier drama is replaced by that of the story structure; the resulting gaps are plugged by the large part that chance and coincidence are allowed to play. So surprise, suspense, variety and sensationalism replace the katharsis and instead of *hamartia* we have vacillation and weakness. These qualities, distinguishable in the early plays, are articulated most clearly in such plays as the *Ion* and the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, the god in the former presented as a buffoon, the goddess in the latter as a last minute deliverer (assuming that the present ending does not differ in substance from the original). Instead of one simple figure, standing out with a massiveness imparted to it much more by the perpetration of the miasmal deed than by any personal qualities, we have a number of humdrum and purely human figures with varying psychological and ethical attributes and their interrelations, which issue in unpredictable decisions, deeds, incidents and catastrophes. The character typology has altered completely. To repeat what has been already said more than once, this is not because the *Iphigenia in Aulis* along with some others like the *Helena*, the *Ion* etc. are unsatisfactory or relaxed works; these crucial features of character and action are to be discovered in Euripidean drama from the beginning until they are, in these plays, composed into the basic pattern of the form. The enigma that puzzles us in the *Ion* or in the *Bacchae* may have resulted not from the attitude of the dramatist to the mythology but from a certain subtle failure in the composition of the pattern, in the conversion of the material from mythology into story, in which bourgeois realism, rhetoric and philosophy play such an important part simply because they make it so much more thrilling. Whatever the Ibsen-like orientation of these new interests in such a play as the *Medea*, in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* they lack any profound effective import, because from the beginning they were incompatible with the inherited tragic mode.

The characters in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* are as garrulous as in the Euripidean play and reveal to us their motives, intentions and aims with embarrassing frankness. The garrulity is not a defect meant to unveil the inner life, a purpose which is clearly set out in the prologue, where we have a vivid dramatic account of the King's rash indecision by the Presbyter (ll. 28ff.). We should contrast this with the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus (ll. 205ff., in which the ritual action is projected with overwhelming force. But in the *Iphigenia* we have only a psychological and emotional crisis and the key is much more domestic. The long speech by Agamemnon (ll. 49ff.) is omitted from discussion since it is purely mechanical, but the domestic nature of the conversation that follows between master and servant should be noted. Domesticity is a major interest of the Euripidean play and, combined with social realism, as in the *Medea*, can make excellent stuff for secular tragedy. It is worked into the father-mother-daughter relationship which is one of the action's themes. The exclusion of the mythical import of kinship makes possible the introduction of long domestic scenes (ll. 907ff., ll. 900ff., ll. 1106ff., etc.). We may criticize or admire them; it has to be realized that earlier drama could not have admitted such scenes because they are so alien to the mythical import. At the end of *Oedipus Tyrannos*, when Oedipus expresses concern for his daughter's fate, it is their condemnation as children of an excommunicated father and of an incestuous marriage that troubles him, and the fatherly feelings are scarcely touched upon. It is the same in the *Oresteia* in which again the theme is the mythical terror of violated family ties.

Again, the inordinate length of most of the speeches is hardly justified by an earlier standard, whereas here they derive their relevance from their new interest. Their purpose is to explicate character, establish individuals sharply distinguished from one another by psychological and emotional traits, without any necessary relevance to the action as a whole. They transform and exalt themselves before our eyes with abrupt suddenness, like *Menelaos* (ll. 471ff.), *Achilleus* (ll. 919ff.) and *Iphigenia* (ll. 1368ff.). The spectator is invited to identify himself with one or other of the characters, hate and despise or love and admire them, and the critic to write their biographies. Criticism of the Bradley school, although it came so much later, now becomes possible.

These men and women are related only to one another, in family relationships but sundered from the obligations of ritual kinship. The fluidity of the dilemmas they all eventually face is a heritage from

the past, but these dilemmas are motivated differently. In the earlier drama they are inherent in the human situation which is defined as an essential contradiction between the will of the gods and men's understanding of it. Aischylos and Sophokles resolve this in different ways. But in Euripides the contradiction springs from the human figures' mutual relations, from their plans, expectations and schemings bearing reference to secular existence alone. The prophecy of Kalchos is of episodic interest in the *Iph. Aul.*, whereas in the *Agamemnon* its part in the action is pivotal.

The episodes are a series of intensely emotional confrontations in which the speakers lay bare their feelings and attitudes and indecisions, revile each other and are then reconciled, or chatter away until they suddenly realize that they are facing an extraordinary situation. From first to last the episodes are a string of scenes of intense psychological, sensational and realistic interest, revealing the most moving, harrowing, agonizing and finally uplifting fatherly, motherly, brotherly, knightly emotions. These, however, so interlock that progress is blocked after every such confrontation until a sudden change of heart on the part of one of the characters (giving rise to speculations as to why and whether sincere), as in the case of Menelaos and Iphigenia, or by a sudden revelation, as during the crucial Klytaimnestra-Achilleus scene by the Presbyter. What the heroine does is truly breath-taking—the breath of Achilleus is so taken away that he is incontinently filled with love for her. The audience is free to share his admiration and to be filled with wonder that the lily-like maiden of a few moments ago (she is perhaps the progenitor of the nineteenth century dream of Miranda) can be so transformed. And this transformation is the most satisfactory contrivance imaginable to remove the last and most formidable deadlock whose only issue seemed to be civil war. In this, of course, our dramatist was prevented from indulging because of the limitations of the traditional material. That archaic and massive consistency of motive which is so impressive and awesome in a Klytaimnestra, an Oidipus, a Herakles (in the *Trachiniae*) is cheerfully sacrificed to the demand, however impious from the point of view of ancient tragedy, of thrill, surprise and sensation. Bourgeois realism, which calls for the presentation of actual squalor, is automatically succeeded by bourgeois idealism, which belongs to pipe-dream. And the pettiness of normal human existence, with the meanness underlying the family and political relations: the sordid and vulgar competition for political leadership, the nagging wife who, when her turn comes,

and harassed by the overbearing husband, the elder brother's and contempt reciprocated by the younger's—alternate with the: the impossible conversion of the brothers, the impossible self-, the beautiful chivalry of the obviously young and handsome Achilles prepared to lay down his life to save the tender and young. All the stock types of later drama have their prototypes here, and one of the reasons why the present play is so significant. Among various motives, most of them new, one is to be noticed in particular: Helen, whose crude intrusion here is the most disturbing imaginable, more than the general 'humanization' of the mythical characters this lays the mythical roots of tragic drama and turns it altogether into object of secular response. Patriotism henceforth passes into the story of literary emotions, with consequences which will be differently. It is the same with another stock attitude in later literature: of the mob (l. 517). Euripides was the first to express it in literature. All the characters, then, expose themselves to analysis and judgment with all the attendant risks. Iphigenia receives a crown of at their hands, Achilles more or less the same, Klytaimnestra sympathy, Agamemnon righteous hate and contempt, and Menelaos condemned as insincere. In other words, the characters no longer solely in terms of the plot, of the central deed, but in terms of a story does not satisfy us unless the characters are each given a life of his and we are enabled to see them as we see our friends and neighbours. Purely as a result of this historical time takes the place of mythical in Euripides, and this is reflected in the constructional pattern. An Aeschylean or Sophoklean drama has a rigidly linear structure, and all episodes bear a ritual sense. So the action is firmly united by certain plot and situational images (i.e. iteration of certain situation types); IT, for example, is governed by the imagery of disease and sterility presented in the prologue and the parodos, and by those of blindness and knowledge in the rest, and by the situational image of waiting messenger, a prophet and an interpreter. In *Iph. Aut.*, indeed in all Aeschylean drama, imagery has become purely decorative, chosen for its effect (appealing to the emotions or evoking beauty and charm). Inner coherence and articulation of ancient tragedy, based on the form of the ritual which must follow an immemorially authorized process, is replaced by the demands of spectacular presentation (suspense, effect) and not those of a strictly determinate action. For action has disappeared. Nothing is done. Nothing really happens that

can disturb the universe. Orders are given, then rescinded. The male protagonists are undecided, weak of will, or given to forming fantastic projects (Menelaos suggesting that Kalchos should be killed off). Only the women show great firmness of will, like women in real life, and Klytaimnestra is a good example. An equally good example is Iphigenia who, once she has formed the resolve to sacrifice herself, will not swerve from it.

Critics point out that Euripides brings down the mythical figures to purely human levels and sometimes also debunks them. The point has been dealt with already and is so fundamental that its significance will bear repetition. The mythical figures cannot be so 'brought down' at all. They are conceived on another and different level, a level of concentration which would be impossible on the normal human plane, of which time as succession is the dominating aspect. But the deed, the destiny, the degradation that constitutes the action together with the redeeming sacrifice belongs to one single moment and confines to one single plane of existence. The dissolution of either through amplification and multiplication would give the figures a freedom of movement and choice which would eliminate the mythical core and generate a certain widespread flabbiness of will, purpose and emotion. And this is exactly what happens in most Euripidean drama including such early ones as the *Medea* and the *Hippolytos*, not to mention the *Iph. Aul.* If the characters are trapped, it is the result of purely human deeds and contrivances which, as it appears, were misdirected, and not the result of something essentially contradictory and unknowable in man's metaphysical existence. In such a scheme men and gods define themselves against each other, but in terms that the former cannot apprehend, as in Sophokles, or, as in Aischylos, do so only after generations ravaged by misdeed and suffering.

In Euripides, then, the characters no longer have the consistency of an Antigone or a Prometheus or an Eteokles or a Philoktetes (which is not psychological consistency). Agamemnon, Menelaos, Klytaimnestra, Iphigenia, Achilleus, flutter from one attitude to another (in the women's case this goes with great firmness of will), one resolve to another, determined and clear-sighted at one moment and bewildered and helpless the next. We have a stream of action that can go on unendingly, for the climax can always be put off, the block always removed, through the introduction of a new and surprising turn of events which cancels the results of past decisions and indecisions, deeds and misdeeds. And the sudden exaltation of Iphigenia—to return to it once again—does not have to be psychologically or otherwise motivated, for without some

With gesture the play might have gone on unendingly. With it, the play ends with a bang as it started with one.

Instead of mythical types, we now begin to have stock types of situation as well as character, which could be introduced in any type of action after major or minor alterations. Oidipus could not exist outside the framework of the particular action in which Sophokles has chosen to put him, so his 'downfall' is not caused by his 'rashness and hotness', as is usually suggested, but is the result of his mythical situation. The Agamemnon of *Iph. Aul.* is not defined in terms of a particular deed of pollution or event of shame but as doting father, henpecked husband, elder brother, army commander faced with mutiny of his troops—but even then the list is not exhausted. He might step out of this play into any other, with some modifications. It is the same with Klytämnestra and Achilles and, most notoriously, with Iphigenia. The Prometheus is another remarkable example, with his loyalty to his mistress and the key part he plays in the twisted progress of the action. We have already known him in the *Ion*, where he plays an equally key role. A character like this or like the Nurse in the *Hippolytos* or *Medea* would be unthinkable in earlier tragedy. A figure completely extraneous to the action takes a dominating part in its unpredictable course. The Nurse in the *Agamemnon* of Aischylos is only a dummy and plays no part in what has happened or is going to happen. As a consequence the Euripidean structure loses essential cohesion and the dramatist comes to arrogate to himself a much greater freedom in the handling of the material than earlier dramatists would have considered desirable or permissible.

This brings us to the consideration of the action itself. In our play it is not only complex in the Aristotelian sense, it is also complicated and no longer guided by a motive inherent in it. The dissolution that overtakes the imagery and characters also overtakes the action. It is merely a series of thrills. The peripeteia from misery to glory does not here, as in Sophokles' *Philoctetes* or in Aischylos' *Eumenides*, result from a certain solution, satisfactory or otherwise, of the dilemma of human will opposing itself to what has been preordained by the gods above or—as in the latter play—of opposition between the upper and lower gods with regard to the correct interpretation of kinship ties. Essentially, such a situation is present in the *Iphigenia*. But this fails to materialize, first because the gods no longer exist in the old sense but as a part of the story, so nothing is really preordained. Second, the



solution comes through a human gesture of supreme nobility and not through the intervention of a benevolent daimon, as in the *Philoketes*.

What, to return to the question asked before, happens in the play? After a series of emotionally lacerating confrontations, punctuated with amusing turns, and of skilful moments of brinkmanship in which disaster is thrillingly averted (moments that climax every episode) we reach a seemingly decisive crisis. Can the action go on after this without altogether destroying the story's inherited structure? Achilles has declared his inflexible resolution to defy the Greek hosts and the king, and a civil war looms. With magnificent daring our heroine is transformed into a heroine with the features of a Livy hero; the daughter's miasmal slaughter is transformed into a beautiful and ennobling act of self-sacrifice in the cause of Hellas against barbarians. The lady's virtue is rewarded by the miraculous apotheosis.

Thus, nothing really happens and nothing is done. The action is undefined and indeterminate except in so far as the demands of presentation are concerned.

Murray is one of the few who have defended the Euripidean chorus on the ground of emotional relevance.<sup>22</sup> But subjective interpretation of this kind is extremely misleading. The chorus is a dramatic convention deriving from its origin in ritual song and is most successfully employed only when its connection with the ritual aspect of the action's significance is clearly sustained. This is generally done in the Aischylean-Sophoklean drama. Its purpose would seem to be to stress the objective fact of pollution directly or indirectly. Indirectly as in the *OT*, in which, in the parodos, the ode describes the plague and the sterility that are afflicting Thebes; directly, as in the same play, in the kommos. Or it may, as in the *Agamemnon*, anticipate, point out, denounce and judge the act of pollution. Euripides increasingly abandons this precise definition of the chorus. Then again, the chorus, by virtue of its function, is related to the protagonists either by kinship or by political ties. If it were not but were only detached spectators or were bound to the protagonists merely by human sympathy or feeling, then it would lose its organic ties with the action.

In the *Iphigenia*, Euripides has shed every point of relevance that the chorus had in the drama of his predecessors and retains it as decor

undramatic convention, a drag on the action, he allows it to exist on a big scale—only after disintegrating the action in radical way. The musical structure is divided from the structure of the action and given an elaboration and beauty all its own, and with the innovation in music introduced by Euripides.

*Iphigenia* chorus is unrelated to the protagonists by either of the ways mentioned above and its functions would seem to be mainly two: to transform the myth into story by eroding its ritual content and to stress the action by love in setting the action in motion. The excitement of the chorus in the parodos communicates itself to the action, and the chorus dwelling on the love interest—this forms the main element in the first and second stasima—introduces a motive hitherto unfamiliar in Greek drama. Helene and Paris are turned into a pair of doting lovers (ll. 101-102) and Achilles also is shown to fall into admiring love for Iphigenia. Euripides was not the first to paint the Trojan war as a consequence of the love between Helene and Paris but there can be no doubt that the dramatization of this legend can in large part be attributed to him. It is clearly noticeable that the ritual violations involved throughout the action are nowhere mentioned by the chorus, which is completely ignorant of its role as judge or interpreter.

The stasima are very pretty by design. The originals are so heavily decorated that they seem predestined for translation by Murray, who, in his introduction, Millot's objection, is perhaps not unfair to the spirit of Euripides. The stasima are mainly descriptive and what feeling or interpretative they contain bears no relation to the action. The parodos describes the chorus' excitement and wonder at the splendour of the Greek hosts and the great heroes and is no prelude to what follows immediately or later. It stands by itself, a self-sufficient whole. The first stasimon is devoted to how destructive it is and how moderate passion is the best.<sup>23</sup> The bow and arrow are mentioned, probably for the first time, to suggest, for the first time, a fixture. The second stasimon refers to the impending fall of Troy and Helene's repentance when it is too late, and ends with a pious wish that such a doom may never visit the chorus' own country.

The third stasimon recalls the marriage of Thetis and the feeling of sympathy-making with which it was celebrated; but a different fate awaits Helen. Then, after she declares her heroic resolve the women sing a song in her honour.

Libertine design must be behind such radical alienation of the chorus from the theme: an alienation that affects not only the content

and purport of the chorus but the significance of the theme as well. Our response to the action is largely directed by the tone and attitude of the chorus. The irrelevance of all the odes underlines the purely artificial and literary orientation of the play, so that no katharsis in the real sense—whether we interpret it as purgation or as purification—takes place. Or, if we accept Else's interpretation of Katharsis,<sup>24</sup> there is no refinement of the action either, for the action was refined from the beginning. Euripides' destruction of the mythical foundation of tragedy had to be inevitably accompanied by the destruction of the musical articulation of the theme of pollution and expiation and, as each character exists separately as a complicated human being, with diverse feelings and motives and attributes, so the musical element is given an independent existence and varied beauty of its own. No special pleading can remove our impression that what was a whole in earlier tragedy has been atomized; what was vital in it has gone out.

Euripides, then, kills classical tragedy. He utterly destroys the inherited mythical infra-structure and, retaining the mythical figures, drastically altering the legends where it suited his purposes to do so, and retaining the broad outlines alone, the mere names of the figures, recreates the drama on a new basis and on a new foundation. Rejected largely by his contemporaries, he satisfied the audience demands of future generations, so that, from the fourth century B.C. onwards, when the living spirit of tragedy had perished and no new masterpieces were added to the existing list, it is his plays that were most frequently revived. From his drama was born, as is well known, New Comedy; but, equally important, serious secular tragedy, exploring the problems of human consciousness in a complicated social order, which had lost its traditional mythical roots—this also was anticipated by him in the *Medea*, say, or in the *Hippolytos*. At the same time, he created, as in the present play, a type of drama which ignores the real problems of human existence and destiny, and is offered only for the entertainment of a sophisticated audience; he invented 'literature'.

1 On the primitive 'moral order' and 'world view' see R. Redfield, *The Primitive World and Its Transformations*, Cornell, 1965, chs. I-IV.

2 See Murray's "Excursus on the Ritual Forms preserved in Greek Tragedy" in J. Harrison's *Themis*, Merlin Press, I 3.

3 The most significant studies in this connection are those by M. Eliade. See his *Images and Symbols*, Harvill Press, 1952, for a useful introduction to the subject.

*Whe's Poetics: The Argument*, Harvard, pp. 389ff.

*Golden Bough*, abridged, p. 594, gives a useful interpretation of the taboo.

*Fort and Responsibility*, Clarendon Press, 1963, pp. 88ff. shows that involves no moral guilt.

if the seer in the *OT* has been ignored by most critics. One of the few is Lesky, *Greek Tragedy*, Benn, 1965. The revelations by Teiresias, inheeded by all, set in motion the process of *teiresias* and *anagnorisis* Max occurs in the fourth episode.

*Myths and Symbols: Patterns of Comparative* ion, Sheed and Ward,

*Harvest of Tragedy*, Methuen, 1966, ch. IX.

With tragedy, however, Homer's work reflects the attitudes of a secular or. See Rohde, *Psyche*, tr. Hillis, Harper Torchbooks, 1966, Vol. I.

not elaborate character studies, see Kitto, *Greek Tragedy*, Methuen, 1964.

Preface to the 1928 edn. of *The Sacred Wood*.

*Legal, Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, London, 1843, p. 70.

It was how Hellenistic and Roman 'art critics' looked upon the achieve-  
ment. Cp. Cicero, *Orator*, 8-9, and Plotinos, *Enneads*, Vol. 8. Both  
the artist as a contemplative who reproduced the vision of beauty in his

*Murex*, 13-

*ia Graeca*, I, 104, 9. Cp. Pliny, *Natural History*,

of Eros in poetry and drama undergoes an extremely interesting develop-  
ment. In Homer (*Iliad*, 3. 442; 14. 295; *Odyssey* 18, 212)  
Eros is a god but stands for violent physical desire and nothing more, over-  
powering and unsettling the limbs. He reappears in the same role in  
120 but is now potent against gods as well; further, along with Chaos  
he is one of the three primeval beings. Th. 201 associates him with  
but not as her son. Poets of the Anakreoniteia however make Aphrodite  
the little playful god Eros, who with his bow and arrows works havoc  
in kind; even mighty Ares is powerless against him. Meanwhile, Alkman,  
and Ibykus turn Eros into the god of passionate sexual desire, whose  
power now greatly magnified—remains the same as in Homer and Hesiod;  
sweet and bitter sweet, bringer of the gift of joy and pain. We are not far  
from the Cupid of Latin poetry, whose image is transmitted to the Renaissance.

who claimed to have 'revolutionized' music, is said to have influenced  
the music of Euripides' plays. Macedon, where Euripides went in 408 B.C.

of the new culture and honoured such representatives of it as Timo-  
leus the tragedian Agathon.

*Euripides and His Age*, H.U.L., 1913.

see Kitto, *op. cit.*, section on Euripides.

*Myths*, tr. G. Highet, Blackwell, 1954, Bk. I, chapter on Euripides.

*op. cit.*

7. The Eros who dominates so many choric odes in Euripides and plays  
his part in the tragic action without making visible appearance is obviously  
of this complex development. The purely Euripidean aspect consists,  
in words (*op. cit.* p. 149), in the fact that "he is no longer an objective  
objectively experienced passion", irresistible and sometimes, as in the  
tragedy, intensified to a pathological degree.

*Myths*, pp. 224-32.

**LOVE AND ASCETICISM IN DONNE'S POETRY : THE DIVINE ANALOGY**

When Donne wrote about one kind of love in terms of another kind, the general enterprise was anything but original. What was original was the extent, suggesting an overwhelming preoccupation and a perpetual inner debate, to which he pursued such analogies through poem after poem, and the changing relations in which he placed very human loves with one another, and with divine love.

Though his first biographer Walton radically simplified the relation between Donne the priest and Donne the secular man into a contrast ('Now all his earthly affections were changed into divine love'), he was right in pointing to the tension as significant, and seeing a kinship with St. Augustine. 'Now the *English Church* had gain'd a second *St. Austine*, for, I think, none was so like him before his Conversion.' This has usually been taken and dismissed as little more than a rhetorical flourish, Walton's appeal to late classical example to justify his writing of a modern saint's life. But Augustine's writings continually return upon the contrast between earthly loves and divine love, a contrast which is dramatised in his *Confessions* in the renunciation of his mistress at about the time he embraced his mother's religion. Yet within this contrast he also plays upon certain resemblances, brings out the element of *eros*, of longing desire for enjoyment of the beloved, embraced by *agape*, Christian charity. And it is notable that the most distinguished modern intellectual biography of Augustine<sup>1</sup> quotes Donne's third satire when it comes to describe Augustine's committal to a Christian-Platonist idea of Truth as transcendent, after his wanderings in Manichean materialism. So Walton probably felt some real relation of sensibility between the two men which we may fail to detect, a relation which is more complex than Donne's tendency in later life to contrast 'the mistress of my Youth, Poesy' with 'the wife of mine age, Divinity.' Similarly when Walton

suggested that there was 'none so like Ambrose' as Donne the priest, and in his *Life of Mr. George Herbert* that his friendship with Magdalen Herbert was 'an Amity, like that of *St Chrysostoms* to his dear and vertuous Olimpius; whom in his Letters, he calls his *Saint*: Or, an Amity indeed more like that of *St Hierom* to his *Paula*; whose affection to her was such, that he turn'd Poet in his old Age, and then made her *Epitaph*,' there was more involved than the decorative colouring of an early Christian parallel. Walton is taking us back to the Christian roots of a very special Western preoccupation with the relation between love and chastity, between body and soul, which is discussed powerfully in the writings of Ambrose and Jerome, addressed to women whom they, in their own sublimated manner, loved.

Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, known as the Latin Doctors, were contemporaries of the late fifth century A.D., even friends, though their lives were spent mostly in widely distant parts of the crumbling Roman Empire, in North Africa, in Milan, the seat of the Byzantine royalty, in Rome, and in Bethlehem. It would not be too much to suggest that in them the difference between love and sex came to full literary consciousness in Roman culture. Of course Plato had made his own fine distinctions for Greece centuries earlier, which worked like yeast in the asceticism of Byzantine Christianity to give it a strong mystical flavour and to justify a cult of purely spiritual love. The Latin Fathers brought to their reading of Plato and Plotinus minds steeped in their own Latin experience. In Jerome and Augustine, Ovid and Juvenal, Terence and Virgil had to come to some sort of terms with the Gospels on the one hand and Greek mystical theology on the other. The atmosphere generated was sometimes fairly hectic, swinging between sharp satirical portrayal of that forked beast humankind and ecstatic self-giving to the divine Bridegroom. Augustine's religious eroticism, Ambrose's dramatisation of chastity, Jerome's fierce satire of sexual appetite in women—the sensibility of Europe was shot through with them long before the Renaissance, which made more secular readers familiar with the original texts at the very time when the attitudes which they present were coming in for new scrutiny and re-appraisal.

Jerome's double vision had a peculiar influence: Chaucer had learnt much from him for his own satirical portraiture of churchmen and women, but Castiglione could point to him as a model for the idealisation of women, rather as Walton was to do in his *Life of Donne*. 'Saint Hierom . . . setteth out certaine of his time with such wonderful prayses, that they

might suffice the holiest man that can be.<sup>2</sup> Augustine's *Confessions* has also been in its own special way a writer's book. Petrarch carried a copy with him continually and seasoned his love-poems with its contrasts, and Shelley took from it his epigraph for *Alastor* ('I did not love but was in love with love, seeking something to love, loving the very state of loving.') and the thought of 'Music, when soft voices die.'<sup>3</sup> Till the Renaissance there was no book like it in its disarming account of an imperfect man's illusions of feeling and intellect, and his gradual ridding himself of them. Even in such an exceedingly modern book as Sartre's *Verbes* there is something of the same process of mind-stripping and interrogation of emotion, though the conclusions are so very different.

Many Renaissance writers must seem to echo Augustine and Jerome, then, when echoing their clergy or Petrarch or Chaucer, but in Donne's writing there is something to suggest a closer first-hand acquaintance. This is not to say that he was always imitating them directly; rather that his problems were in some respects rather like theirs. Whether he read any of their writings as part of his early Recusant education there is no means of knowing, just as his Paradox, 'That Virginity is a Vertue,' cannot be dated with certainty in his student-days at the Inns of Court. What is certain is his general concern with religious questions from about that time, sharpened by the early death of his only brother, imprisoned for serving the Catholic cause. Choosing one's own stand can never be a simply academic matter when some of one's family are living underground; and there are signs that Donne both loved and hated the old Catholic values, including that hierarchy of virtuous states which placed absolute virginity closest to God. The great editions of Erasmus had brought Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome to new attention in the sixteenth century. But it is significant for the times that Erasmus both admired Jerome's powerful *Letters* with particular warmth, and in his own writings called in question his cult of chastity and his undervaluing of marriage. And Donne's Paradox on virginity echoes the Erasmian point of view as well as the Erasmian style in defending marriage as the true fulfilment of virginity.<sup>4</sup>

When Donne began helping the Anglican Bishop Morton with his anti-Catholic propaganda in the 1600's, it is not surprising that he added to his library several works relating to the ascetic orders—the Rules of St Benedict and St Francis, *De Vita Cartusiana*, the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian, the life of the Blessed Aloysius Gonzaga the Jesuit, Crececius on the founding of monasticism.<sup>5</sup> And in *Pseudo-martyr* (1610)

he translated admirably a considerable passage from St Ambrose's *De Virginitas*, one of his celebrated works on the vow of chastity. This reading, I suggest, partly followed the promptings of his own very personal interest in ascetic love, which pre-dated his 'spiritualising' love poems by some time and continued beyond them. The motto he usually wrote in his private books is significant: 'Per Rachel ho servito, E non per Lea' ('For Rachel I have served, and not for Lea'), the conclusion to Petrarch's *Rime*, CCVI. For medieval ascetic writers the Biblical love-story of Jacob was interpreted to contrast Lea, the wife of a forced match, with Rachel, the wife of love, as the active life to the contemplative. Petrarch had secularised the story to refer to Laura's uniqueness, worthy of a life's unrewarded service; Donne interestingly restored it to its religious sense.

The beginning of Donne's poetic enterprise has looked like an attempt to annihilate the years between Ovid of the *Amores* and the 1590's, to recover from surrender to Petrarchan passivity and self-abasement that dominating male sensuality untroubled by any Christian qualms. But Donne could not quite do it: in his most successfully direct 'Elegie: To his Mistress Going to Bed' he has to bring the language of ascetic theology to the help of a clever sexual invitation.

Full nakedness, all joyes are due to thee.  
As soules unbodied, bodies uncloth'd must bee  
To taste whole joyes. (33-35)

In his treatise *De virginitate* Ambrose had expressed the ascetic idea strikingly, weaving together Plotinus and the *Song of Songs*:

On hearing the voice of the Word do not seek the garment you took off, to put it on again. . . . Your pleasure, then, virgin, will lie in the depth of your own heart; you will be your own sweet source of pleasure. You will bri yourself none of the dissatisfaction that often comes to sinners for you will keep drawing more and more delight from a pure inner simplicity, denuded of all the deceitful outer trappings of the flesh.<sup>6</sup>

In the most famous of his *Enneads*,  
even more ecstatic note, as he descri  
9703:

So we must ascend again to the good, which every soul desires. . . . The attainment of it is for those who go up to the higher world, and are converted and strip off what we put on in our descent; just as for those who



go up to the celebration of sacred rites there are purifications, and strippings off of the cloths they wore before, and going up naked until, passing in the ascent all that is alien to the God, one sees with one's self alone That alone, simple, single and pure, from which all depends and to which all look and are and live and think.... If anyone sees it, what passion will he feel, what longing in his desire to be united with it, what a shock of delight!

This is the kind of mystical state beyond morality which is made by Donne an analogy for the amorality of love. The ascetic writers had found in earthly love an analogy for divine love: Donne reversed the process. Women are 'mystique books',<sup>8</sup> in their white robes they remind of angels or penitents, but these are preliminary roles to revelation of their naked grace.

This seems to have come far from Ovid, but his poetry had not been devoid of a kind of playful divinisation as part of love's game. Even those sexual swaggerers, the Paris and Acontius of his *Heroides*, could fall into the manner, though not for long; and the *Amores* have touches here and there.

Parce, per o lecti socialia iura, per omnes  
qui dant fallendos se tibi saepe deos,  
perque tuam faciem, magni mihi numinis instar,  
per tuos oculos, qui rapuere meos.

[Spare me, O by the laws of love's comradeship, by all the gods who oft lend themselves for you to deceive, and by that face of yours, to me the image of high divinity, and by your eyes, that have taken captive mine.]

If you Christianised this, but maintained the tone of easy blasphemy, would you not arrive somewhere near Donne's *Elegie*? Of course such Christianisation involved an increase of tension: the sin-stricken otherworldly attitude Donne had to subdue in his poem was a more powerful interior force than Ovid's ritualised reverence for the gods. His poem is remarkable for just that strength of his to subdue so much to the affirmation of the body.

In another much-admired poem of the 1590's, the third *Satyre*: 'Of Religion', the analogies run in the opposite direction, and the life of the body becomes a shadow of the soul's life.

Hard deeds, the bodies paines; hard knowledge too  
The mindes indeavours reach, and mysteries  
Are like the Sunne, dazling, yet plaine to' all eyes. (86-88)

Flesh (it lyes death) and joyes which flesh can taste,  
 Thou lov'st; and thy faire goodly soule, which doth  
 Give this flesh power to taste joy, thou dost loath.<sup>10</sup> (40-42)

There is something ridiculous about the attitudes behind man's pursuit of both the body's pains and the body's joys. Men multiply courageous efforts for useless ends (lines 17-32) and do not face the inner enemy (33-42). Their follies in embracing a particular sort of religion or irreligion are comparable to their follies in love and marriage. Here satire is at the other side of Donne's acceptance of a variant of the ascetic ideal. The remnants of broken Christendom are imperfect brides, but Truth is a bride worthy of being striven for.

On a huge hill,  
 Cragged, and steep, Truth stands, and hee that will  
 Reach her, about must, and about must goe;  
 And what th' hills suddenness resists, winne so.

The caustic realistic vignettes of the lover of an ageing beauty *passée* at Geneva, the perverseness that is stirred by ugliness at Geneva, the youth submitting to an arranged marriage in England, the sceptical isogynist the universalist libertine, give place to a more sober allegorical language which mounts to be dissolved in 'God himselfe.'

The classical element in Donne's *Satires* has been pointed out by Pearson and others, and there is no doubt that he learned much from Lucan and Juvenal. But the classical satiric stand-point is one of moderation between extremes; whereas Donne's standpoint is more extreme, more religious than moral. The contemporary satirist Joseph Addison could write consistently from the stance of *In medio virtus* ('virtue the mean'), whereas his stance is rather *In summo foelicitas* ('Joy is the extreme')<sup>11</sup> symbolised by his mistress, named variously as 'virtue' (*Satire I*, 41) and 'my Mistrresse Truth' (*Satire III*, 80; *IV*, 163) and 'law' (*Satire V*, 69). In the second *Satire* we are made aware only of her price, as love and marriage are bought and sold, honour is prostituted to the same as in brothel'd strumpets' and lawyers behave like 'carted whores' used for their own ends 'heires melting with luxurie.' In this *Satire* Donne does appeal to the mean, but notably it is in contrast to the ascetic and orgiastic religion.

in great hals  
 Carthusian fasts, and fulsome Bachanalls  
 Equally 'I hate; meanes blesse. (105-107)

Interestingly enough, it is to the mean he appeals also in his prose paradox on virginity. 'Virginity is a virtue, and hath her throne in the middle: The extreams are, in *Excesse*, to violate it before marriage; in *Defect*, not to marry. In ripe years as soon as reason perswades and opportunity admits, These extreams are equally removed from the mean: The *excesse* proceeds from *Lust*, the defect from *Peevishnesse*, *Pride* and *Stupidity*.' This is not the gayest of Donne's *Paradoxes*; it is as though he is parodying the solemnity of moral discourse to press a point somewhat removed from the usual solemn conclusions.

But it was in the first *Satyre* that Donne presented the reverse of his view of nakedness in *Elegie XIX*: why should the man who enjoyed the nakedness of flesh 'Hate vertue, though shee be naked, and bare?'

At birth, and death, our bodies naked are:  
And till our Soules be unapparelled  
Of bodies, they from blisse are banished. (42-44)

Man was naked in Eden, and even after the Fall his dress was coarse and simple, fit for conferring 'With God, and with the Muses.'<sup>12</sup> Here again the norm is the ascetic norm of the Platonic writers and the Latin Doctors, who preserved the pressure of *eros* in their rhetoric at the very point where they denied its fleshly fulfilment, by turning towards their mistress Wisdom.

Now let us enquire concerning this, what sort of lover of Wisdom thou art, whom thou desirest to behold with most chaste view and embrace, and to grasp her unveiled charms in such wise as she affords herself to no one, except her few and choicest votari .<sup>13</sup>

It seems clear, then, that Donne's divided feelings on the matter of asceticism give a peculiar strength to some of his poetry of the '90's: to the mockery of the love-elegies is added the salt of blasphemy, to the mockery of the satires is added a strain of religious exaltation. Yet at the same time as he was addressing poems to fleshly mistresses and claiming Truth as his lady, he was playing a small literary game with his friends of the Inns of Court involving them and their Muses. In a succession of epistles to 'Mr. T. W.', 'Mr. R. W.' and 'Mr. B. B.' words are spun out of words. These young men 'have no Mistress but their Muse,' not quite in Sidney's sense of addressing poems to fictitious ladies, but in the sense that they are in love with poetry without having any subject other than themselves and their light-hearted friendship.

Our Minds part not, Joyne then thy Muse with myn,  
For myne is barren thus devorc'd from thyne.

Though there was mock-serious definition of 'the Muse beeing the Soules Soule/of Poets,' which 'methinks should ease our anguish,/Although our bodies wither and minds languish,' there was also plenty of what one of the friends called 'chaste and mistique tribadree.' The ultimate source of this trans-sexual joking was a paradoxical passage in Plato's *Symposium* about the spiritual children conceived and brought forth by those who have risen above the flesh:

But there are some whose creative desire is of the soul, and who conceive spiriually, not physically, the progeny which it is the nature of the soul to conceive and bring forth.... By intimate association with beauty embodied in his friend, and by keeping him always before his mind, he succeeds in bringing to birth the children of which he has long been in labour, and once they are born he shares their upbringing with his friend; the partnership between them will be far closer and the bond of affection far stronger than between ordinary parents, because the children that they share surpass human children by being immortal as well as more beautiful.<sup>14</sup>

And before Donne, Montaigne had allowed his mind to play on the topic, considering that books were more satisfactory children than flesh-and-blood offspring. 'And I wot not well, whether my selfe should not much rather desire to beget and produce a perfectly-well-shaped and excellently-qualified infant, by the acquaintance of the Muses than by the acquaintance of my wife.'<sup>15</sup> The Muse, then, is the poet's *anima*, which both unites him spiritually to his male friend, and brings forth his poems. Already Donne is, however slightly, playing with the idea of a union of souls rather than bodies.

'The Muse' was part of the literary vocabulary of the 1590's, with these associations: a sonnet of Donne's in this group, 'If thou unto thy Muse be marryed,' reminds one of Shakespeare's sonnet 'I grant thou wert not married to my Muse,' and both are concerned with the complex of poetry-writing and the inspiration of a close friend. Years later, when Donne came to write 'To Mrs. M. H.,' addressed to Magdalen Herbert, this conceit of his youth still appealed to him sufficiently to become the basis of the joke in the epistle's first part. (One is reminded of Yeats's remark about the Muses in *A Vision*—they 'sometimes form in these low haunts their most lasting attachments'.)

Mad paper stay, and grudge not here to burne  
With all those sonnes whom my braine did create. (1-2)

His child-poem is a naughty creature which will die when it reaches 'that perplexing eye'; only when her miraculous hand touches it it will revive: 'Thou grow'st by this / Her creature; glorify'd more then before.' Magdalen Herbert herself is now his Muse.

Then as a mother which delights to heare  
Her early child mis-speake halfe utter'd words,  
Or, because majesty doth never feare  
Ill or bold speech, she Audience affords.

But he is a good enough Platonist to know that he must praise his friend's beauty, both of body and soul. 'In his pregnant condition physical beauty is more pleasing to him than ugliness, and if in a beautiful body he finds also a beautiful and noble and gracious soul, he welcomes the combination warmly!'<sup>16</sup>

The poem ends with an affectionate reference to the man she intends to marry, Sir John Danvers:

But so much I doe love her choyce, that I  
Would faine love him that shall be lov'd of her. (51-52).

Donne has succeeded with good-humoured delicacy in suggesting a marriage of souls which does not involve any bodily claims, but does not suffer either from repression of feeling.

We have not yet described, however, the interesting conclusion to the correspondence of the Muses in the 1590's, which redeemed its triviality in that fine epistle to Rowland Woodward:

Already, in another poem to Woodward he had corrected his description of the Muse as 'the Soules Soule' to the more platonically correct 'Vertue,

our formes forme and our soules soule, is.'<sup>17</sup> This poem is a fuller celebration of virtue as the basis of friendship. It declares a pause in the writings of 'love-songs weeds, and satyrique thornes' for reflection and introspection. The mood is one of self-reproach for pursuing 'vanity' rather than 'vertue'. He feels like a widow who regrets the folly of too many marriages, or a man who has played rather than marrying: for both, 'there is no Vertue, but Religion.' That is, since they cannot atone perfectly for their earlier sins of omission, the only way out of their plight is the 'religious life' in two senses, first 'faith, and deare honestie,' and secondly the 'Vice-covering discretion' of the nun or monk. We are again in the world of ideas of Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose. Indeed Grierson, and following him Milgate, have indicated an Augustinian source for the line: 'Quod non possint ibi verae esse virtutes, ubi non est vera religio.'<sup>18</sup> One of Jerome's most notable letters was in praise of Fabjola, turned nun after two sensational marriages; and others among his correspondents were widows, some of them merry, whom he exhorted to a life of retired contemplation. And Augustine's liaison, though not technically adultery, was renounced by him as vanity. So 'to use, and love Poetrie, to mee, / Betroth'd to no one Art, be no adulterie; / Omissions of good, ill, as ill deeds bee.'

There is no doubt that by the time Donne came to preach his sermons he was familiar with the epistolary style of the Latin Doctors, which had this in common beyond their idiosyncracies, that they used the language of warm affection, tinged with erotic feeling, to advocate the ascetic life, weaving together Cicero's idea of friendship with the *agape* of St John's *Epistles* and something of the Platonic *eros*.

Sir, more then kisses, letters mingle Soules;  
For, thus friends absent speake.

Professor Milgate has quoted St Ambrose in illustration of these lines from 'To Sir Henry Wotton,' as he does again for two lines in 'To Sir Henry Goodyere.' His dating for the poem to Goodyere is 1605-10, but for the Wotton poem he has suggested an earlier date, 1597-98, that is, around the time Donne was also writing 'Like one who in her third widowhood,' which he places in 1597. Already that epistle had the ring of the patristic epistolary manner, in its combining of exhortation to the retired life, symbolised in sexual renunciation, with a sharp side-glance at the world's ways and warm personal feeling.

Manure thy selfe then, to thy selfe be 'approv'd,  
 And with vaine outward things be no more mov'd,  
 But to know, that I love thee 'and would be loved.'<sup>19</sup>

What became of my lady Virtue after 1600? She became incarnate, most obviously in those aristocratic ladies to whom he addressed his later verse-epistles, the Countess of Huntingdon, Lady Bedford, and Mrs. Herbert; and most movingly but secretly in the lady of the later *Songs and Sonnets*. Most puzzlingly, she died in Elizabeth Drury, the young daughter of his patron. The verse-epistles have been charged with affectation: how could *all* these ladies be Virtue in the flesh? There is a monotony about the basis of his praise, as well as a strong suspicion of exaggeration. Already aware of this possible criticism, Donne wrote a reply into his poems: if the ladies are not really so virtuous, then let them take his portrait as an example to follow. The charge of monotony, of over-generalisation, is a more modern one, and J.B. Leishman pointed out that Shakespeare's sonnets are also open to it.<sup>20</sup> Donne is both more playful than Shakespeare in his pursuit of the idea of Beauty and Truth incarnate and the complications following, and incidentally also a better Platonist. In finding these qualities in a number of ladies successively he is rising above the obsession with a single human example such as dominates Shakespeare's sonnets.

Elizabeth Drury has always seemed to be a special case of Virtue incarnate, even when her portrait is accepted as the 'idea of a Woman and not as she was.' Modern studies have brought out the pervasive Augustinian element in the *Anniversaries*, and have tended to present them as a fulfilment of Donne's spiritual progress, poems about his own inner death and resurrection even more than the death and ascension to heaven of a young girl's soul.<sup>21</sup> This emphasis on inner development, however true, should not be allowed to play down the recognition of a tenseness in the poems, partly related to Donne's ambivalent attitude to woman. Over against the ideal maiden we have:

For that first marriage was our funeral;  
 One woman at one blow, then kill'd us all,  
 And singly, one by one, they kill us now.

We doe delightfully our selves allow  
 To that consumption; and, profusely blinde,  
 We kill our selves to propagate our kinde. (*Anatomy*, 105-10)

Spring-times were common 'cradles, but are toombes,  
 And false-conceptions fill the generall wombs. (385-86)

For though the soule of man  
 Be got when man is made, 'tis borne but than  
 When man doth die. (451-53)

If in the manner of his eulogy Donne continues the strain of his verse epistles to ladie., in his wry scepticism about the body, women, sex, marriage and child-bearing he is writing in the vein of the *Metempsychosis*, 'Loves Alchymie,' and 'Farewell to Love.' This is 'spiritual progress' in the patristic manner with a vengeance: the leap from satire to religious exaltation in the context of meditation upon death reminds one especially of Jerome's elegiac epistles, as does his sense of living in a critical time of the world's decline; and Donne's 'double' vision of woman, at once destructive and idealising, akin to his. For Jerome's most powerful and repeated argument for virginity is not positive (as in Ambrose), but negative, the dispraise of sex and marriage. And it is Elizabeth Drury's virginity which distinguishes her from Donne's other paragons of virtue.<sup>22</sup>

A recent writer<sup>23</sup> has related this doubt, in such startling contrast to his celebratory love-poems associated with Ann More his wife, to the depressed mood of the years following his own marriage, which he described in a letter of 1612 as his 'Metaphoricall death.' His lyric 'A Feaver,' in which the sick lady is 'the worlds soul,' in danger of leaving it a carcass and all other women worthless, has this in common with the *First Anniversarie*, that the lady is the all-too-fragile barrier between his idealism and his scepticism, so that without her he would relapse into simple misogyny.

What does distinguish the lyric is that it is a living woman on intimate terms with him who preserves his idealism. In the *Anniversaries* the



relation of the ideal woman with flesh and blood has become more tenuous, more unstable.

She, of whom th'Auncients seem'd to prophesie,  
When they call'd vertues by the name of shee,  
She, in whom vertue was so much refin'd,  
That for Allay unto so pure a minde  
Shée tooke the weaker Sex, she that could drive  
The poysonous tincture, and the stayne of Eve  
Out of her thoughts, and deeds; and purifie  
All, by a true religious Alchimy,  
Shée, shée is dead; shée's dead: when thou knowest this,  
Thou knowest how poore a trifling thing man is.

(*Anatomy*, 173-84)

Embedded in the *Anniversaries* is Donne's sense of the fragility of virginity at various levels: the loss from religion of a stable incarnate symbol of worshipful femininity; the loss of the 'white innocence' of his own *anima*, with which death alone will re-invest him (*Progres*, 114); perhaps also the loss of Ann More the pure virgin as she became merged in the dead world of commonplace things as wife and prolific mother. The *First Anniversarie* is a poem of longing for the lost 'idea of a woman' to give what he calls 'heart,' that is, value and meaning, to ordinary experience. Without a transcendent ideal, experience becomes its own justification, 'For every man alone thinks he hath got / To be a phoenix,' (216-17) creating his own subjective values, and in constant danger of falling back into nothing (157) through his inability to create value. The relation between the ideal and this world is always precarious: at best, it causes refinement of life, and at worst it dies through contact with the grossness of life as it is. The ideal is like a virgin whom men want to know in the flesh; but in this impossible knowledge she is lost. Shakespeare had explored the theme in the sonnet 'They that have power to hurt and would do none' and in *Troilus and Cressida*; Donne pursues it throughout the *Anniversaries*.<sup>24</sup> Elizabeth Drury was

One whom all men who durst no more, admir'd,  
And whom whoe'er had worth enough desir'd,  
As when a temple's built, saints emulate  
To which of them it shall be consecrate.

(*A Funeral Elegy*, 63-66)

So the world studied whose this piece should be,  
Till she can be no body's else, nor she,  
But like a lamp of balsamum desir'd

Rather, t'adorn than last, she soon expir'd,  
Cloth'd in her virgin-white integrity;  
For marriage, though it do not stain, doth dye.  
(*Ibid.*, 71-76)

ready in the *Funeral Elegy* one of the prime paradoxes of the *Anniversaries* is carried in the pun on *dye*. Either the ideal dies (rising above worldly corruption) or dyes (coloured, destroyed by that corruption). man's desire to keep her at their level is misdirected; it is rather they must rise to her level (*Anatomy* 281-82, 391-92; *Progress* 65, 294, *et. seq.*). Truth still stands on a high hill.

The *Anniversaries* then manage to comment extensively on the war between the sexes, and to have it both ways. If woman brings man to disaster at a sexual level, and is thus 'the weaker Sex' corrupted by 'the stayne of sin', she also stands over against man, and by her intuitional type of wisdom makes all his book-learning and cerebration look ridiculous. Finally this is part of the force of the refrain of the *First Anniversarie* in its first variation (183-84, see above), with its triple 'Shee' balanced against 'man'.<sup>25</sup> It was 'she from whose influence all impressions came at by receivers' impotencies lame). Yet there is also a new world associated with her, where right relations are paradoxically restored:

The matter and stuffe of this,  
Her vertue, and the forme our practi (Anatomy, 77-78)

It seems to match the Aristotelian and Augustinian view of the balance between the sexes: man is superior through his 'skill of right doing' in which reason governs. *Materia appetit formam, sicut foemina virum.*<sup>26</sup> But the interpretation of Aristotle this had been taken to imply the inferiority of woman, a view which Augustine refutes in *Confessions* XIII. 32: man and women are equal at the level of mind; only sexually is there a differentiation. In Donne's couplet, he is playing with the whole discussion to expose a special instance (and special instances are the stuff of dilemmas) in which woman is superior and yet in a sense 'matter.'

So half-concealed in the *Anniversaries* is a hierarchy of male and female, with the midwife Death (*Anatomy*, 454) and Eve at the foot, leading through man whose soul is 'she' to the 'She' who is Elizabeth Wray. But ironically she is a type, not only of the Virgin Mary, as Lewis Martz has taught us, but of the Perfect Man, the Christ; and ultimately, unlike 'This man, whom God did woo' unsuccessfully (*Anatomy*, 7) she was 'Betrothed to God, and now is married there' (*Progress*, 462).

She is established as a type of Christ in the introduction to the *Anatomy*, where language commonly applied to him is now made hers: 'Her death did wound, and tame thee than.' She is compared to 'A Prince, expected long' who has now died, and it is 'some blasphemy' to say he is merely dead. Her memory 'Creates a new world; and new creatures be / Produc'd,' who need to be told of 'the dangers and diseases of the old' in order to avoid them. When one 'knows' her death, one will realise the true misery of man, as in meditation on the Crucifixion. This seems to be the reverse of the sacred parody described by Martz in which the language of secular love-poetry is applied to the divine Beloved. Instead, divine language is being applied to human life, the kind of language that we find in such a contemporary poem as Giles Fletcher's *Christ's Victorie, and Triumph in Heaven, and Earth, over, and after death* (Cambridge, 1610).<sup>27</sup> This poem is witty in a manner half patristic, half Italianate, and its closing description of ascent to heaven is, like Donne's, based upon St Peter Damian's famous Latin hymn, 'Ad perennis vitae fontem.' Just as striking is his sudden break in the sacred narrative to compare King James with the Saviour, as small to great. The whole tone is optimistic: England is a great country, but heaven a greater. It would not be unlike Donne to make fun of such facile sacrilegious compliment by offering an even lengthier sacrilegious compliment of his own, but to an unknown girl, and set within a more critical negative world-view. It is an interesting index of English taste in poetry around 1610 that shortly after Fletcher's poem was published, in 1614, there appeared under the title *Vla Regla* a series of elegies on a dead lady, one of which, entitled 'Parodia,' is a pastiche of passages from Fletcher's poem referring to Christ's death and resurrection, but now altered a little to refer to the lady.<sup>28</sup> The *Anniversaries* are also a *parodia* in this sense, that language usually understood to refer to sacred figures now become Elizabeth Drury's.

They are a kind of extended riddle in reverse, with the literal answer, the dead girl, stated plainly from the beginning and then surrounded by a multiplicity of identities. So different readings of the poem have proposed different 'solutions'—that she 'is' the Virgin (from Ben Jonson to Marts), Queen Elizabeth and more recently the Logos, Sapientia, and St Lucy, not to speak of her creating an occasional Laura-effect. Perhaps the truth is that she 'is' all these and more (the *anhima mundi*, the divine image in man, for example); she wears many faces, and this is all part of Donne's 'spiritual mirth.' In the *Anniversaries* play is associa-

with the new-born innocent earth which mingled and varied colours every day (*Progress* 349-50), and also with the imitation of heavenly realities by earthly creatures.

And 'tis in heav'n part of spiritual mirth  
To see how well the good play her on earth. (*Elegy*, 105-6)

But if readers are enjoined to imitate their saint, to 'play' her, she herself presented as playing a variety of roles in imitation of heaven. This is the very quality of her innocence, in contrast to the sad variations in mortal lovers, who are 'both fluid, chang'd since yesterday'.

So flows her face and thine eies, neither now  
That saint, nor Pilgrime, which your loving vow  
Concernd remains. (*Progress*, 397-99)

Donne gives examples of blasphemy twice in the *Anniversaries*: it means the reduction of human death to flat physical explanation (*Anatomy*, 1) and the false suggestion that virtue has been sullied with vice (*Progress*, 1). On the other hand, Ben Jonson used the word in an opposite sense in his criticism of the *Anniversaries* in the 'Conversations with Drummond,' to mean not reduction of human life but exaggeration, and Donne's reply to him did not really deny this change. He rather shifted the emphasis away from any one of his many 'sacred references' to 'the Idea of a woman.' By applying so many figures to his Idea he is in a larger way also parodying the style of religious praise, that multiple naming of God which through its very plenitude and contradictoriness leaves us finally with a sense of the mystery beyond all the names.

But soone, the reasons why you 'are lov'd by all,  
Grow infinite, and so passe reasons reach;  
Then backe again to 'implicite faith I fall.'"

The mystery however is not of divine but of human life. It seems then that the loosening of Donne's Catholic ties allowed him a particular playful freedom in his use of certain kinds of traditional religious imagery and concept, and yet was not so absolute that he could not hark back on the appropriate occasion to a praise, somewhere between jest and earnest, of virginity.

There is still another aspect of the paradoxicality of the *Anniversaries* which relates to religious discourse and especially to St Augustine. This is his play on the idea that Truth can die. As a young man Augustine was troubled by the thought that man's truth dies with him: this involved

doubt both of meaningful immortality and of transcendent values. What if all human thought is relative, time-limited? From this state of mind he was rescued by his reading of the Platonists, especially Plotinus, who presented him with the eternal world of Ideas. His *Soliloquia*<sup>50</sup> presents the problem through a discussion between Reason and his Soul. 'Can Truth perish?', Reason asks, and there follows a short scholastic dispute which leads up to: 'Does it not seem to thee that when true things perish Truth does not perish, as Chastity dies not when a chaste person dies?' Augustine agrees, and Reason proceeds, 'Truth is not in mortal things. But Truth is, and is not nowhere. There are therefore things immortal. And nothing is true in which Truth is not. It results, therefore, that nothing is true except those things which are immortal... Now everything which is not true, is false. Nothing therefore is rightly said to be, except things immortal.' And 'things immortal' are symbolised in the transcendent lady Wisdom who presides over the *Soliloquia*. Donne entertains the notion that Truth (Virtue, Chastity) can die, and that in this death 'our weakness was discovered' (*Anatomy*, 52). She dies because man is too imperfect and sinful to keep her. That was Augustine's dread. However, Donne adds, with the divine Incarnation and Atonement in mind, that Truth is recovered through death. 'Though [a good man] had right, and power, and Place before, / Yet Death must usher, and unlocke the doore!' (*Progres*, 155-56). The death which Augustine presented as the way to reach Wisdom was the renunciation of this world:

\* Donne sharpened the tension of the ascetic theme in his elegiac framework, but his concluding emphasis on essential joy could hardly be more Augustinian.

So far this essay has been concerned almost entirely with poems on the periphery of modern interest in Donne: for the majority of readers the poetry of Donne continues to mean the *Songs and Sonnets*, and particularly those poems in which he uses the language of extremes to celebrate the middle state of love between gibaldry and renunciation, and explores in the manner of the Renaissance love-theorists the reconciliation of body and soul, of action and contemplation. When the divine analogy makes its appearance in these poems it owes something to Petrarch's love-religion, the idea of the relation of lovers as a cult, sacred and secret, separating them from the ignorant laity of common earthly lovers, and to be described in riddles. Yet Petrarch, while admitting the pull of the flesh, had far from celebrating it, lamented it, and it was the Italian sonneteers of later centuries who moulded his language

to serve more frivolous ends, 'Swearing his sense is merely deified.'<sup>31</sup> Donne knew as well as anyone the temporary euphoria of sex which persuades one that he is 'as it were immortal here on earth'; he made it a merry matter of praise in his 'Paradox' on virginity, in some sort analogical to 'perfect immortality in heaven', and a matter of dispraise in 'Farewell to Love'. He knew also that the sense of immortality which lovers feel can be related, not to sexual fulfilment but to restraint, that even sexual love at its highest has its own asceticism and its own special virtues. He was far from being the first Renaissance writer to say so;<sup>32</sup> the great Renaissance defence of married love against medieval values involved proving that the virtues of marriage are at least equal to the virtues of the virgin state, and this could lead to the discovery of the qualities of the ascetic life at the heart of marriage itself. So the divine analogy was again in this context put in reverse, to demonstrate resemblances between the love of women and the love of God. Of course Dante and Petrarch had explored such resemblances long before, but not in relation to marriage.

'A Valediction: forbidding Mourning' demonstrates strikingly Donne's transformation of imagery which traditionally represented the relation of the single soul with God. Take 'gold to avery thinnesse beate' A passage from the medieval allegorical poem, Guillaume Deguileville's *Le Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine*, translated into English by John Lydgate,<sup>33</sup> illustrates notably how the refinement of gold images the trial of the soul to reveal virtue. When a figure called Tribulacion approaches the Pilgrim, she explains the use of her instruments to him:

My toonges (as I shal expresse)  
Ben ycall'd ek 'Dystresse',  
Wych that werkyn to an herte  
fful gret anguiss and gret smerie;  
And in a pressour off gret payne  
They kan ful offte A man dystreyne  
Both with-uten and with-Inne,  
As gold ffloyl yhetyn thynne. (15893-15900)

Tribulacion is 'gold-smyth off Hevene, and the forgeresse / Wych in erth fforge the crownys of paradys.' She has a double function: she makes the evil worse and refines the good. More than that, she tests men to disclose of what sort they are: the wicked like empty barrels make most noise when she beats them. But when she tries the Pilgrim with her instruments, he calls on the Blessed Virgin, so that Tribulacion has

finally to praise him—his sufferings have only served to raise his mind to a heavenly level—and lets him go. In 'A Valediction: forbidding Mourning' Donne moves to a certain extent within a similar frame of ideas. Besides the 'expansion' which their two souls 'endure' 'Like gold to avery thinnesse beate', the tribulation of parting is treated as a test of the lovers' virtue: 'As virtuous men passe mildly away, . . . So let us melt, and make no noise,' as proof that they live beyond the profane sublunary level. According to the older ascetic way, the soul's virtue is tested individually, as in the death of the good man at the poem's beginning; but Donne's lovers are tried together, and the gold beaten thin is an image of their interdependence in virtue, which is made explicit in the last three stanzas. As Ben Jonson has it in his poem on virtuous love, 'It is a golden chaine let downe from heaven' which 'combines / The soft, and sweetest mindes in equall knots.'<sup>34</sup>

The image of the compasses, with which Donne's poem closes, could also refer to man's centre in God, and this is how he used it in his 'Obsequies to the Lord Harington':

O soul! O circle! why so quickly be  
Thy ends, thy birth and death, clos'd up in thee?  
Since one foot of thy compass still was plac'd  
In heav'n, the other might securely've plac'd  
In the most large extent through every path  
Which the whole world, or man, the abridgment, hath.

(105-10)

This is the way Plotinus had presented the image of movement round the centre in *Enneads*, 11. 2, 'On the Movement of Heaven', where, starting from Plato's *Timaeus*, 40, he meditated upon its metaphorical application to the soul. 'If it is the centre of soul that is in question, soul runs round God and embraces Him lovingly and keeps round him as far as it can; for all things depend on him: since it cannot go to him it goes round him.' But Plotinus also thought of the universe and the individual soul as a hierarchic arrangement of sphere within sphere, the higher and outer causing the movement of the lower and inner circle. 'So the lower soul, as the higher encircles it, inclines and tends towards it, and its tendency carries round the body with which it is interwoven.' Such an idea of sphere within sphere as an image of the two souls was in Donne's mind when he wrote of 'trepidation of the speares' (11), that is, 'liberation of the ninth, the crystalline sphere, which communicates its movement to all the spheres beneath it.'<sup>35</sup> And he continued to play upon it in describing

Now Thy soule the fixt foot, makes no show / To move, but doth, if the  
 other doe." (27-28). The paradox of the fixt foot is that it too describes  
 a small inner circle at its free end. Hidden in this enigmatic image, then,  
 is the double nature of woman as Donne saw her: she is at once the  
 lower soul which 'leanes, and hearkens after' the higher ('inclines and  
 tends towards it', as Plotinus has it), and the centre of virtue, a divine  
 adumbration.

Thy firminnes makes my circle just,  
 And makes me end, where I begunne.

Each is one another's best, not sentimentally so, but in  
 virtue. This is the asceticism of mutual faithfulness.

Love had from the beginning, then, something of the appearance  
 for Donne of 'an anchorit', as he called the deity in his elegy, 'The Autum-  
 nall', when considering the love of an ageing yet charming woman.

Here, where still Evening is; not noone, nor night;  
 Where no voluptuousnesse, yet all delight. (21-2)

Under his varying experiences of love, voluptuary and marital, admiring  
 and flirtatious, ran his pursuit of Lady Virtue, and he might see her  
 shadowed forth in strange, even paradoxical places. But he knew very  
 well that these shadows arose and would pass, in spite of asserting 'He  
 that believes himself, doth never lie.' In the third *Satyre* he had shown  
 himself a good Platonist, in the Augustinian manner, and continued to  
 be. From time to time he might have the sense of being 'as it were,  
 Immortall here on earth', and from this sense many of his best poems  
 sprang; but he was no romantic, lost and bewildered when his Muse  
 died. Instead he turned his amorousness rather fiercely upon God, as  
 he had learnt from the Latin Doctors to do.

By 1619, the date of 'A Hymne to Christ,  
 Into Germany', he had made their cast of min

Seale then this bill of my Divorce to All,  
 On whom those fainter beames of love did fall;  
 Marry those loves, which in youth scattered bee  
 On Fame, Wit, Hopes (false mistresses) to thee.

He can now express renunciation in the full traditional sense. From  
 end to end of his poetry, Donne's images from nature are so few that  
 they strike us powerfully when they come, and all the more when they  
 appear at his turning to 'God himselfe'. Yet as the third *Satyre* rises



from social criticism to divine considerations it rises to 'those blest flowers that dwell / At the rough streames calme head, thrive and do well' (103-4); and in 'A Hymn to Christ' he descends below ground.

As the trees sap doth seeke the root below  
In winter, in my winter now I goe,  
Where none but thee, th'Eternall root  
Of True Love I may know. (13-16)

Yet these 'images from nature' are not original to Donne: they are Augustine's. In the last book of the *Confessions* the sea, symbolising 'the bitter-spiritedness of men's wills', is set in contrast to the plants growing at the fountain of life, and bearing fruits of mercy and justice. And the conclusion of the book is a splendid assertion of the relativity of all means to God other than Himself. 'The mind, subjected to thee alone and needing to imitate no human authority, dost thou renew after thine own image and similitude.'<sup>36</sup>

Early and late, the root of love is one of the images to which Augustine returned most often. 'Now is the season of winter, your glory is not yet apparent. But if your charity is deeply rooted, like many trees in winter, the cold passes away, and the summer, the Day of Judgement, will be at hand: then shall the greenness of the grass wither away, then shall appear the glory of the trees. *For you are dead*, says the Apostle, just as trees during the winter; they appear as if withered and dead. Well, then, what have we if we are dead? The root is deep within: where our root is, there is our life also, for there is our charity.'<sup>37</sup> That is how he put it in his early *Ennarationes in Psalmos*, which Donne commended in his own sermons; but the context of a later homily, the eleventh on *St John's First Epistle*, is even more apposite. Commenting on 'perfect love casteth out fear', Augustine contrasts two wives: 'The one saith, I fear to be condemned': the other, 'I fear to be forsaken.' The one does not love her husband, and her appearance of chastity is worldly prudence; the other loves truly, and so is restless in the beloved's absence. 'Shall we get at that soul, think you, that we may address it? think you, is it here in this congregation? Is it here, think you, in it is chancel? think you, is it here on earth? It cannot but be, only it is hidden. Now is the winter: within is the greenness in the root.'<sup>38</sup>

F. Manley, *The Anniversaries* (Johns Hopkins: Baltimore, 1 3); W. Milgate, *The Satires, Epigrams, and Verse Letters* (Oxford, 1967). His funeral elegies, which have not been re-edited thoroughly since Grierson, are quoted from his edition (Oxford, 1912).

1 Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (London, 1967), chap. 8.

2 *The Third Book of the Courtier*, translated by Hoby (Everyman), p. 203.

3 'Nondum amabam, et amare amabam, quaerebam quid amarem, amans mare.' 'Music, when soft voices die' must have grown out of Shelley's reading of a *Confessions*, X, on memory, and especially sect. 13.

4 *Enamorus' Colloquia*, which became one of the most famous school-texts all over Europe, contains a lively discussion, 'Proci et Puellae', between a girl who is taking of becoming a nun and a boy who wishes to marry her. When she says, 'chastity is the state most pleasing to God', her lover replies 'And just for this reason do I want to marry a chaste girl, so that with her I shall share a chaste marriage. We'll bring forth children for the country and for Christ. What a small difference there is between this kind of marriage and virginity!' Against the argument of the girl that this is a violation of virginity, he replies that abstinence is rather a kind of violence against nature. Abstinence from sex is no virtue, but intercourse is virtuous. 'I shall be your king, and you shall be my queen.' These are arguments which Donne takes up in his Paradox XII, which has been printed in John Hayward's Nonesuch Library edn. of *Donne's Poetry and Prose* (London, 1929).

5 All these works are listed in Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne* (Cambridge, 1958), Appendix IV, 'Books from Donne's Library'.

6 Translated by James Shiel, *St. Ambrose, The Nun's Ideals* (Dublin 1903).

7 *Enneads*, I. 6. 7. translated by A. H. Armstrong (Loeb *Plotinus*, vol. 1, London, 1967).

8 The image of woman as a book is Danteian (see E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, London, 1953, chap. 16). Donne had a copy of Dante's *Convivio* in his library, where he might have found such a comparison (x): Dante's commentary on his poems is going to draw attention away from accidental ornaments, since as with the beauty of a lady 'the splendour of the jewels and of the ornaments excite more admiration than she herself. He, therefore, who wishes to judge well of a lady looks at her when she is alone and her natural beauty is with her, free from all accidental ornament.' (Trans. E. P. Vieu, London, 1887, p. 36).

9 *Amores*, III. xi. 45-48.

10 Compare *Paradoxes and Problemes*, Paradox VIII, 'That Nature is our first Guide.' Nature is given two contrary senses, 1) 'our essence, our definition,' 'our bodies afflictions, ... our bodies pleasure ... the worst part of us.'

11 This Latin motto is used by Spenser, *Shepherd's Calendar*, 'Iulyen' Emblems.

12 One has only to contrast Joseph Hall on the same theme, based on Juvenal's satire, in *Virgilemiarum* (1597), III. 1. He contrasts truly man with sophisticated urban man:

They naked went; clad in ruder hide,  
Or home-spun russet, void of forraine pride ...

The effect is altogether more classical than Donne's.

13 St. Augustine, *Soliloquia*, 1. 22, in *Basic Writings of St. Augustine*, edited by W. J. Oates (New York, 1948), vol. 1.

14 Plato, *The Symposium*, translated by W. Hamilton (Penguin, 1951), p. 90.

15 John Florio, *The Essayes of Montaigne*, ed. Henry Morley (London, 1894), 11. viii. p. 201.

16 *Ed. cit.*, p. 91.

17 The poem is 'If, as mine is, thy life a slumber be.'

18 *De civitate Dei*, xix. 25.

19 St. Augustine's *Epistulae*, 11, written to his friend Zenobius from his philosophical retirement at Cassiacum, is a good example. The gist of the letter's argument runs: 'We know that everything perceivable by the senses is transitory, and divine philosophy teaches us to control the body and allow the soul to pursue what is permanent. Even so, though my love for you transcends the senses, yet I miss you when you are absent in the body. Surely this fault is excusable; I want my absent friend to miss me as much as I miss him.' Here Augustine plays delicately upon the soul-body relation.

20 J. B. Leishman, *Themes and Variations* i 111. 4.

21 Louis Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), chap. 6; Frank Manley, *John Donne: The Anniversaries* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1963); Richard E. Hughes, 'The Woman in Donne's *Anniversaries*,' *English Literary History*, 34 (1967), pp. 307-26.

22 This point has been made best by Patrick Crutwell, *The Shakespearean Moment* (New York, 1960), chap. 3. The fact that Elizabeth Drury was 'not yet fifteen' relates interestingly to the approach of fifteen when the Virgin Mary was supposed to become betrothed to Joseph, and to Donne's view, in *Paradox XII*, that virginity only became an active virtue in girls after they were fourteen. That Donne was well aware of the battle between Love and Chastity in Petrarch's *Trionfi* is made clear by *Progres*, 363-4, which renders 'Trionfo del Castita,' 89-90:

E, la concordia ch'è sì rara al mondo,  
V'èga con Castita somma Beltate.

And she made Peace, for no peace is li  
That Beauty and Chastity together ki

23 R. E. Hughes, in article cited, note 21.

24 Richard Southern, St. Anselm's modern biographer, has described as 'a work more reminiscent of the later Donne than of the later Anselm' his famous meditation, 'Deplo ratio virginitatis amissae' (Lament for lost Virginity), which was frequently reprinted during Donne's life-time, and was translated into English, W. P. *Saint Bernard his Meditations* (4th edn, London, 1631). 'Ah purity, no

my loved, but my lost one, no longer my joyous, but my abandoned one, either hast thou descended? in how foul, how bitter mire hast thou left me?"

25 Compare a similar play in the epistle to the Countess of Huntingdon; 'Man Gods Image, Eve, to mans was made':

Anglican work in praise of the Virgin Mary cited by Martz, Anthony Staff's *The Femall Glory* (1635), has also this kind of play in its two prefaces, 'the Feminine Reader' and 'To the Masculine Reader.'

26 Gardner, *The Elegies, and the Songs and Sonnets*, p. 206, discusses this fully. 27 The poem's eighth stanza describes man as 'Of this great world the small tome / Of the dead world, the live and quick anatomy.' Yet he is a nothing (l. 12): 'Who is it sees not that he nothing is, / But he that nothing sees?' And the first stanza describes the Saviour in the paradoxes which Donne applied toabeth Drury:

The birth of Him that no beginning knew,  
Yet gives beginnin to all that are born;  
And how the Infinite far greater grew  
By growing less; and how the rising morn,  
That shot from heaven, did back to heaven return;  
The obsequies of Him that could not die,  
And death of life, end of eternity,  
How worthily He died, that died unworthily.

Donne's day Damian's hymn was commonly attributed to Augustine, as in the translations in Joshua Sylvester's *Du Bartas His Divine Weekes, and Weekes* (London, 1620), pp. 1113-1117, and in *The Meditations, Mammall, and Soliloquia of the Glorious Doctour St Augustine* (1631).

28 The edition of Fletcher's poem by W. T. Brooke (18) describes this *parodia* 'Note D', pp. 137-39. Another parody of a similar sort, belonging to the 1550's, appears on pp. 175-77, in which the prayer 'Ave Maria' is applied to Queen Mary.

29 From the epistle to the Countess of Bedford, 'Reason is our Soules left aid, Faith her right,' 13-15.

30 *Soliloquia*, ll. 27-29, in the edn. cited above, note 13. Petrarch had also noted the death of Truth in his *Rime*. 'Alas, dust has become her fair face, which alone was made for us till now the sign of heaven and of good.' (*Rime*, 8). Love and Courtesy have died with Laura (352), the shoot of Virtue has been uprooted (338); yet Fame and Virtue are not in death's power and live on. Indeed Petrarch certainly knew the *Soliloquia*, since they are the model of his *Secretna*. Donne, in contrast, harps more exclusively on the death of virtue; his contrast between earth and heaven is more a reckoning of the moral balance

than an estimate of personal loss. So Petrarch seems more romantically modern, Donne more moralistic!

31 Marston, *The Malcontent*, II. i. 3.

32 See A. J. Smith, 'The Metaphysic of Love', *Review of English Studies*, IX (1958), pp. 362-75.

33 *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, ed. F. J. Furnivall (Early English Text Society, 1899-1904), vol. 2., p. 427.

34 From 'Epode', 'Not to know vice at all', first printed in Robert Chester, *Love's Martyr* (1601), along with Shakespeare's 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'.

35 Helen Gardner, *The Elegies, and the Songs and Sonnets*, p. 189.

36 *Confessions*, XIII. xii, 'For the soul dies not so as to lose all motion; because it dies by departing from the fountain of life...' XIII. xvii: 'But as for the souls that thirst after thee, and that appear before thee (ling by other bounds divided from the society of the sea), them dost thou water by a secret and sweet spring....'

37 Dame Scholastica Hebgin and Dame Felicitas Corri n, *St. Augustine on the Psalms* (*Ancient Christian Writers*, vol. xxx, London, 19 ), vol. 2, on Psalm-36. 1-2.

38 *Homilies on St John's Gospel, etc.* (Library of Fathers, IX. 8.

**NATYASASTRA**, (A Treatise on Ancient Indian Dramaturgy and Histrionics) ascribed to Bharata-Muni, translated and edited by Manomohan Ghosh. Vol. I (Chapters I-XXVII), with an introduction and various readings. Revised second edition. Manisha Grantha, Calcutta, 1967.

The scholarly world will be most grateful to Dr. Manomohan Ghosh for the very precious contribution made by him to the knowledge of ancient Indian dramaturgy, and especially for the unrelenting patience and devoted competence with which he has fulfilled the enormous task of establishing and editing a critical text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and of offering the larger public a readable translation of that important treatise. The second part of the work (chapters XXVIII-XXXVI) edited and translated by him was published by the Asiatic Society, Calcutta—the first in 1956, the translation in 1961.

The present reviewer is concerned with the first part alone, both text and translation. Dr. Ghosh is the worthy successor of a line of scholars who have consecrated their energies to the study of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. The first complete edition of the text was made by Pandits Shivadatta Kashinath Pandurang: it was published in Bombay in 1894, in the collection *Kāvyamālā*. In 1898, J. Gresset, a disciple of Paul Regnaud, edited critically the first fourteen chapters, from the Lyon University. He came the Baroda edition (1936-1964), under the editorship of M. R. Dani. Finally, the Kashi Sanskrit Series of Benares, published in 1929, offered a more or less complete text of the treatise. On the basis of the existing texts, and with the help of other manuscripts, Dr. Ghosh has given us a critically reliable text, without claiming that it is absolutely final.

To both text and translation, the editor has given a substantial service. As both prefaces overlap, we shall analyse them together. What does Dr. Ghosh insist on the difference between the Greek and

the Sanskrit drama. As an "imitation of life and action", the Greek drama is concerned primarily with the development of the plot. It does not attach much importance to the external elements of decoration and make-up. The very use of the mask is an evident handicap. Indian drama, while giving to the plot its due importance, has a great predilection for the spectacle itself: dance, songs, instrumental music, costumes, make-up, facial expressions, all have an essential part to play in the representation. In technique, too, there is a marked difference. The Greek drama is first and foremost a literary production in which the spoken word is the essential element, whereas the Sanskrit drama, besides the dialogue, exploits with equal effectiveness gestures, gesticulations, feats of arms, dance and music. All these means of dramatic expression are studied in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* with the purpose of indicating how they have to be used in order to produce the specifically dramatic 'imitation' (*anukarṇa*) of the activities of gods, demigods or mortals, and make it a 'visual' or 'spectacular' feast for the eyes of the spectators. Hence, the numerous stage-conventions which, like all artistic devices, treat reality with a great amount of freedom, concerned as they are, not with a material copy of what they imitate, but with a suggestive rendering of an otherwise dumb reality. Except for the unity of impression, the Sanskrit drama is not hampered by the artificiality of restricted time or space. It moves freely, allowing the action to develop swiftly or leisurely according to its own tempo.

The Sanskrit drama is, therefore, much more than a dialogue to be heard: it is a spectacle to be seen. And that spectacle, a living picture of all possible aspects of life, without rigid division of genres, offers to the spectators entertainment, instruction, consolation, enlightenment and wisdom. Among the spectators, there were a few who were not satisfied with the mere pleasure of witnessing a successful performance. They wanted to probe further and to know the psychological basis of dramatic enjoyment. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* has analysed the psychological mechanism of enjoyment, thus giving to an imposing number of commentators the opportunity of displaying their virtuosity in subtle psychological speculations.

Regarding the division of the drama into ten types and regarding the structure of the play, the Introduction to the Translation has a few interesting paragraphs which we need not summarise here.

In his attempt to determine the date of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Dr. Ghosh has succeeded in marshalling quite an impressive number of arguments.

He himself acknowledges that "taken individually the different data may not be considered strong enough to warrant any definite conclusion." We feel that even their cumulative impact is far from convincing. One has the impression that the editor's conclusion unconsciously colours the argumentation: it appears to be not so much a conclusion as a conjecture seeking corroboration where it can find it. Not that we have any better suggestion to offer: the date of 500 B.C. is quite possible. Our humble opinion is that an encyclopaedic treatise like the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, depending as it does on previous treatises and having been a favourite ground for further additions and interpolations, can hardly be dated with accuracy.

In conclusion, the work of Dr. Manomohan Ghosh marks an important step forward in the history of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*: it has brought us closer to the original treatise and it will enable many to get a better picture of that wonderful period of ancient Indian culture whose vitality is vividly reflected in such works as the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

**ASIAN IDEAS OF EAST AND WEST: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India**, Stephen N. Hay (Harvard East Asian Series 40, Massachusetts, 1970), Indian edition, Bombay, Rs. 90.

কবি রবীন্দ্রনাথ

খ্যাতির বিড়ম্বনা কাকে বলে রবীন্দ্রনাথের জীবন তার প্রমাণ। শোনা যায় তাঁর নোবেল পুরস্কারপ্রাপ্তির সংবাদ এলে তিনি নাকি বলেছিলেন, 'আমার শান্তি চিরকালের মতো ঘুচে গেলো'। দেশের রাজনৈতিক আন্দোলনের গতি-প্রকৃতিতে হতশ্রদ্ধ হ'য়ে তিনি যখন তাঁর সাহিত্য সংগীত এবং ব্রহ্মচর্যাশ্রম নিয়ে আরো বেশি ব্যাপৃত থাকবার কথা ভাবছেন, তখন অপ্রত্যাশিতভাবে তিনি বিশ্ববিখ্যাত হ'য়ে গেলেন। এরপর রবীন্দ্রনাথ আর কোনোদিন সাধারণ নাগরিক হিসেবে বাটরে বাটার সংযোগ পাননি, কেননা নোবেল পুরস্কারবিজয়ী রবীন্দ্রনাথ এখন 'প্রাচ্যের দূত', 'এশিয়ার কণ্ঠ', 'ভারতের ধ্বজ'। কবিরূপে ইউরোপে রবীন্দ্রনাথের খ্যাতির উত্থান-পতন প্রসঙ্গে তাঁরই জীবনের একটি ঘটনা মনে পড়ে। রবীন্দ্রনাথ ঠাকুর তাঁর স্মৃতিকথা 'অন দি এভেন অব টাইম' (১৯৫৮)-এ লিখেছেন :



অর্থানিতে [রবীন্দ্রনাথের] বই বিক্রি হল লক্ষ লক্ষ। যে-ব্যাঙ্কে রথালটির টাকা জমা পড়ছিল, তাঁরা ঘন ঘন রিজার্ভা ক'রে পাঠাল, অর্থান মার্কেট মূল্য হ্রাস পাবার আগে আমরা টাকা তুলে নিতে চাই কিনা। আমরা যখন অর্থানিতে গিয়ে পৌঁছলাম, ততদিনে যে-লক্ষ-লক্ষ মার্ক জমা পড়েছিল, তারতীয় মুদ্রায় তার মূল্য দশ হাজার টাকার বেশি হয়ে না। আমাদের সঙ্গে বসাই শহরের একজন ব্যবসায়ী ছিলেন, তিনি পরামর্শ দিলেন, লামান্ডা টাকা তুলে কী হবে, তার চেয়ে জমানো টাকায় ব্যাংকেরিয়ান বণ্টকিনে রাখা অনেক ভালো। কিছু দিন সবর করলে আমার মার্কেট মূল্যমান নিম্ন হুঙ্কি পাবে। তাঁর এই সত্বপদেশ কাগে পরিণত করার দু-চারদিন আগেই ব্যাঙ্ক থেকে এই মর্মে চিঠি এল বাবার নামে যে-টাকা জমা পড়েছিল তার মূল্য কয়েক আনায় এসে পিড়িয়েছে, হুতরাং তাঁরা অ্যাকাউন্ট বন্ধ করে দিতে বাধ্য হচ্ছেন। অল্পের ভ্রাতা বাবা লক্ষপতি হওয়ার থেকে রেহাই পেয়ে গেলেন। (পূর্বোক্ত গ্রন্থের বঙ্গাবগদ 'পিতৃস্মৃতি', পৃ ১৩৪ ত্র)। ৫

আমার মনে হয় পশ্চিমের পাঠকসমাজের কাছেও কবি রবীন্দ্রনাথের মূল্য ঠিক এই ভাবেই হঠাৎ হ্রাস পেয়েছিলো। কিন্তু কবি রবীন্দ্রনাথের আকর্ষণ ক'য়ে গেলেও ব্যক্তি রবীন্দ্রনাথের খ্যাতিকে অনেক বেশের রাষ্ট্রনেতারা কাজে লাগাবার চেষ্টা করেছিলেন—এ-বাগপারে পান্ডিত্যের মুশোলিনি এবং প্রাচ্যের কাউন্ট ওকুমার মধ্যে কোনো পার্থক্য নেই। রবীন্দ্রনাথের মহত্ব এইখানে যে তিনি কখনো সচেতন ভাবে এই রাজনৈতিক উদ্দেশ্যের শিকার হননি। তিনি বিশ্বভ্রমণ উপলক্ষ ক'রে মানব-সংস্কৃতি বিষয়ে বক্তৃতা করেছেন, কিন্তু হুলুড খ্যাতির মোহে কোনোদিন নিজের বিবেককে বিসর্জন দেননি। তাছাড়া মনে রাখা দরকার যে তিনি তাঁর বিদেশযাত্রাকে দ্বিবিজ্ঞ ব'লে মনে করতেন না। বারবার তিনি তাঁর ভ্রমণকে তীর্থযাত্রার সঙ্গে তুলনা করেছেন। ফলে কোনো ক্ষোভ বা তিক্ততা তাঁর মনে ছিলো না।

পশ্চিমে রবীন্দ্রনাথের খ্যাতির উত্থান-পতনের ইতিহাস বিস্তৃত করেছেন এ. আরনসন তাঁর 'রবীন্দ্রনাথ ও ওয়েস্টার্ন আইজ' (১৯৪৩)-গ্রন্থটিতে। প্রজিত মুখার্জির 'প্যালেস টু অ্যামেরিকা' (১৯৬৪)-র বিষয় মার্কিনদেশে রবীন্দ্রনাথ। শক্তি দাশগুপ্তের 'টেগোরস এশিয়ান আউটলুক' (১৯৬১) বইটির প্রথমমাংশে রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্যতত্ত্বের আলোচনা আছে, কিন্তু বিতীয়াংশে তিনি গুণানকার স্থানীয় সাময়িকপত্র থেকে সাময়িক রবীন্দ্রনাথের অভ্যর্থনার বিবরণ সংগ্রহ ও সংকলন করেছেন। 'ভারতে জাতীয়তা ও আন্তর্জাতিকতা এবং রবীন্দ্রনাথ' (৪ খণ্ড) গ্রন্থের লেখক নেপাল দক্ষিণদার নামকরণে যতটা উচ্চা-ভিলাবী, কাণ্ডত তিনি পদ্ধতিতে 'রবীন্দ্রজীবনী'কার প্রভাত মুনোপাধ্যায়ের অস্বাভাবী—বিস্তারণের চেয়ে বিবরণে তাঁর আগ্রহ। এছাড়া গুজ, এল্‌মন্ট, কালিদাস দাগ,

কিত্তিহোবান সেন গ্রন্থের চিঠিপত্র, দিনপত্র, ব্যক্তিগত অনেক মূল্যবান তথ্য ইত্যদ  
 বিকশিত। সেগুলি একত্র ক'রে রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্যাত্মের দেশ-বিদেশে প্রতিক্রিয়া  
 বিষয়ে সম্পূর্ণ ইতিহাস এ-পর্যন্ত লেখা হয়নি। শে-অভাব পূরণ করলো টিফেন এন.  
 হে প্রবীণ 'এশিয়ান আর্টভিয়ার্স অব ইস্ট অ্যান্ড ওয়েস্ট—টেগোর অ্যান্ড হিড  
 ক্রিটিক্স ইন জাপান', চায়না অ্যান্ড ইণ্ডিয়া' (১৯৭০) নামক তথ্যপূর্ণ গ্রন্থটি। লেখকের  
 আগ্রহ রবীন্দ্রনাথের সাহিত্য-প্রভাব বা -রুতিম্ব পিন্ধে নয়, এশিয়ার অল্পতম প্রধান  
 দৃষ্টি দেশে কবির চিন্তাধারার প্রতিক্রিয়া বিশ্লেষণই তাঁর লক্ষ্য। টিফেন হে শুরু  
 করেছেন এই তথ্য থেকে প্রাচ্য-সংস্কৃতির ঐক্য এবং অসংগত বিষয়ে পাক্ষাত্যবাসীর  
 বোধধারণা সেটা মনগড়া। আসলে চীন-জাপান-ভারত ইত্যাদি দেশের ভৌগোলিক  
 প্রকৃতিতে বড়োটা পার্থক্য, ততোটাই তফাৎ তাদের সংস্কৃতিতে। ফলে রবীন্দ্রনাথ  
 যে এশিয়াবাসীর তথ্য প্রচার করতে দূরপ্রাচ্যে গিয়েছিলেন তা ওপানকার বুদ্ধিজীবীদের  
 ঘনপুত হয়নি। কেননা ভারতের মতোই চীন-জাপানেরও এশিয়াবাদ বিষয়ে নিজস্ব  
 ধারণা ছিলো। রবীন্দ্রনাথ যখন দূর প্রাচ্য ভ্রমণে যান, তখন ওদেশের লোকেরা  
 ভাষা করেছিলেন যে তিনি তাঁদেরই মতে সাধু দেবেন। কিন্তু কার্যত তা হ'লো না  
 দেখে কুল বোঝাবুঝির সঙ্গী হ'লো। আসলে এশিয়ার বিভিন্ন দেশ রবীন্দ্রনাথের  
 নাম শোনে নোবেল পুরস্কার প্রাপ্তির পর। একজন এশীয় এই সম্মান পেয়েছেন  
 এটাই পরম পৌরবের, কিন্তু তাঁর সাহিত্যের সঙ্গে প্রত্যক্ষ পরিচয় খুব কম ব্যক্তিরই  
 ছিলো। ফলে এশিয়ার বহুবিস্তৃত কবি সবচেয়ে বিরল পঠিতদেরও অল্পতম।  
 বিশ শতকের প্রথম দ্ব-তিন দশকে এশিয়ার বুদ্ধিজীবীদের স্বরূপ বুঝতে হ'লে টিফেন  
 হে-র গ্রন্থটির গুরুত্ব অস্বাধারণ। বিপুল পরিজ্ঞেয় লেখক তাঁর মতের সমর্থনে অল্পতম  
 তথ্য সংগ্রহ করেছেন। তিনি চীনা-জাপানি-বাংলা-গুজরাটি-ইংরেজি ইত্যাদি নানা  
 ভাষার প্রকাশিত সাময়িকপত্র এবং গ্রন্থাদি ব্যবহার করেছেন। তাছাড়া রবীন্দ্রনাথের  
 সুপ্রচীণ লম্ব উপলক্ষে তিনি সাতাশি জন এশীয় বুদ্ধিজীবীর প্রতিক্রিয়া বিশ্লেষণ  
 করে এই ভাব-আন্দোলনের স্বরূপ বোঝবার চেষ্টা করেছেন। এই সাতাশি জনের  
 মধ্যে আর্টচরিশ জন জাপানি, চব্বিশ জন চৈনিক, পনেরো জন ভারতীয়। টিফেন হে  
 সাহেব এলুমহস্ট এবং কালিদাস নাগের ব্যক্তিগত দিনপত্রি দেখার সুযোগও পেয়েছেন।

হে-র প্রাথমিক লক্ষ্য হ'লো প্রাচ্যবাদের তথ্যটি যে পশ্চিমের আমদানি সেটা প্রমাণ  
 করা। এই উদ্দেশ্যে তিনি রবীন্দ্রনাথের এশিয়াবাদের সঙ্গে চীন জাপানের প্রাচ্যচেতনার  
 পার্থক্য বিচারিত ভাবে আলোচনা করেছেন। এই কারণে আলোচ্য বইতে বিশ  
 শতকের প্রথমার্ধে ভারতীয় বুদ্ধিজীবীদের সঙ্গে সমসাময়িক চীনা-জাপানী বুদ্ধিজীবীদের  
 ধর্মস্বাভাব তুলনামূলক আলোচনা অনেকগানি অংশ জুড়ে আছে। রবীন্দ্রনাথের চীন-

জাপানজন্ম উপলক্ষ করে তিনি পাস্চাত্য অভিযাতে প্রাচ্যের প্রধান-তিনটি দেশের বুদ্ধিজীবীদের জটিল প্রতিক্রিয়ার ইতিহাস বিবৃত করেছেন। রবীন্দ্রনাথ প্রথমবার জাপান ভ্রমণ করেন ১৯১৬ এবং চীনদেশে গিয়েছিলেন ১৯২৪ খ্রিষ্টাব্দে।

ওকামুরা-র জাপান নয়, ওকামুরা-র জাপান

রবীন্দ্রনাথ আমন্ত্রিত হয়ে প্রথমবার জাপানে যাননি। ১৯১৬ খ্রিষ্টাব্দে তিনি মার্কিন যুক্তরাষ্ট্রে বক্তৃতা করার জন্য বারো হাজার ডলার পান। সেই টাকায় তিনি জাপান হয়ে আমেরিকায় বাবার সংকল্প করেন। কিন্তু তাঁর সাংস্কৃতিক সফর যে রাজনৈতিক উদ্দেশ্যে ব্যবহৃত হবে একথা জানলে বোধহয় তিনি সাবধান হতেন। ১৯১৫ খ্রিষ্টাব্দ থেকেই রবীন্দ্রনাথ জাপান বাবার কথা ভাবছিলেন। কিন্তু ঐ-বছর দক্ষিণ আফ্রিকা থেকে গান্ধী ও তাঁর শিষ্যবর্গ শান্তিনিকেতনে এসে অতিথি হন। তাঁদের সঙ্গে দেখা করার জন্য রবীন্দ্রনাথ সম্ভবত তাঁর ভ্রমণ স্থগিত রাখেন। কিন্তু তিনি না-গেলেও রবীন্দ্রনাথের আত্মীয় এবং তাঁর জাপান ভ্রমণের ব্যবস্থা করতে যত্ন নেন পি. এন. ঠাকুর এই চম্পলরিচয়ে বিপ্লবী রাগবিহারী বহু জাপানে পালিয়ে যান। রাগবিহারী বহুর পরবর্তী কর্মজীবন আমাদের সবার জানা। সন্ত্রাসবাদী হল শুধু এই একবারই রবীন্দ্রনাথকে ব্যবহার করেননি। মার্কিন দেশে পলাতক জনৈক সন্ত্রাসবাদী আর্মস্টার্ডায়ে অবস্থিত জনৈক ভারতীয় বিপ্লবীকে চিঠি লেখেন যে, তাদেরই নির্দেশে নাকি রবীন্দ্রনাথ জাপানে গেছেন। তিনি জাপানের প্রাক্তন প্রধানমন্ত্রী ওকামুরা এবং তৎকালীন প্রধানমন্ত্রী তেরাউচি-র সঙ্গে কথাবার্তা বলেছেন। এই চিঠিটা প্রাপ্তকর হাতে পৌঁছবার আগেই পুলিশের কাছে চলে যায় এবং সানজানসিসকোর বিখ্যাত ইকো-জার্দান ঘড়বস্ত্রের মামলার সময়ে প্রকাশিত হয়। রবীন্দ্রনাথ সঙ্গে-সঙ্গে এই সংবাদে তিক্তহীনতা জানিয়ে প্রেসিডেন্ট উটলসনকে টেলিগ্রাম করেন। কিন্তু উক্ত ব্যাপারেই জানাজানি হয়ে বাবার পর তৎকালীন ব্রিটিশ-সরকার রবীন্দ্রনাথের জাপান ভ্রমণ স্থলভয়ে দেখেননি। জাপানে ব্রিটিশ রাষ্ট্রদূতের কাছে রবীন্দ্রনাথের পরিচয়পত্র দেবার জন্য বাঙলার ছোটোলাট লর্ড কারমাইকেলকে বিলেডের কর্তৃপক্ষ ডাঙ্গনা করেন। রবীন্দ্রনাথের অবস্থাটাও কল্পণ। তিনি যখন জাপানে অধ্যাপকবাদের মহিমা প্রচার করতে যান, তখন তাঁরই একজন দেশবাসী সন্ত্রাসবাদী রাগবিহারী সেখানে আত্মপ্রার্থী। শুধু তাই নয়, তিনি জাপানের সাহায্যে ভারতকে মুক্ত করার কথা ভেবেছিলেন। একই উদ্দেশ্য নিয়ে আরো পঁচিশ-ছাশিশ বছর পরে হত্যাকাণ্ড গুপ্তে গিয়েছিলেন।

অন্তিমিকে জাপান ১৯০৫ খ্রীষ্টাব্দের জাপান-রুশি চুক্তি অংশদ্বারা ভারত বিদেশী শক্তির দ্বারা আক্রান্ত হ'লে ব্রিটেনকে সাহায্য করতে প্রতিশ্রুত ছিলো। কিন্তু তা-সত্ত্বেও ভারতের মুক্তিআন্দোলনের জন্ত জাপনসরকারের সহায়তাকৃতি যে এশিয়াবাসদের প্রেরণায় এমন মনো করবার কোনো কারণ নেই। ১৮৭৫ খ্রীষ্টাব্দের রিকুদা বীপপুঞ্জে, ১৮৯৫ খ্রীষ্টাব্দের তাইওয়ানে, ১৯০৫ খ্রীষ্টাব্দের দক্ষিণ ম্যান্চুরিয়ায়, খ্রীষ্টাব্দের কোরিয়ায় এবং ১৯১৪ খ্রীষ্টাব্দের জার্মান অধিকৃত অকল্ডলিতে জাপানের বহুতর প্রভাবপ্রতিষ্ঠিত হয়। জাপানের তখন সাম্রাজ্যবিস্তারের অনেক স্বপ্ন — রবীন্দ্রনাথের এশিয়াবাসদের সঙ্গে তার এশিয়াতত্ত্বের আকাশ-পাতাল তফাৎ।

রবীন্দ্রনাথ গিয়েছিলেন শুকাকুরার জাপানে দেখতে, কিন্তু ফিরে এলেন শুকুমার জাপান দর্শন করে। সবচেয়ে মজার ব্যাপার, রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রথম জাপান ভ্রমণের সময় এই শুকুমার দলটো গোড়াতে বেশি উৎসাহ প্রকাশ করেছিলেন। রবীন্দ্রনাথ যখন জাপানে যান তখন দেশে প্রগতিমুখী ছিলেন কাউন্ট শুকুমা। এর সঙ্গে রবীন্দ্রনাথের দু-ঘণ্টা নিরন্তর মাকুংকারের ব্যবস্থা হয় (এই সম্মান রবীন্দ্রনাথ জাপানে দায় কখনো পাননি)। মাকুংকার প্রদানময়িত্বকালেই চীনের ওপর নিয়ন্ত্রণ কর্তৃত্ব হৃদয় করার উদ্দেশ্যে কুখ্যাত একুশ দশা দাবি (১৯১৫ খ্রী) করা হয়েছিলো। শুকুমা আবার ভারত-জাপান মৈত্রী সম্ভারও সভাপতি ছিলেন। কিন্তু ভারতবর্ষ নিয়ে তাঁর জ্ঞানের একটি নমুনা দেখা যেতে পারে। টোকিও-র কোনো একটি বুদ্ধিমন্দের থেকে রবীন্দ্রনাথকে প্রদত্ত অভিনন্দনপত্রের উত্তরে তিনি বাঙলায় বক্তৃতা করেন। সভাপতির ভাষণে কাউন্ট শুকুমা বলেন যে তিনি ইংরেজি না-জানার জন্ত রবীন্দ্রনাথের বক্তৃতা মূল ভাষণে অন্তর্ভুক্ত করতে পারেননি, এজন্য তিনি দুঃখিত। কাউন্ট শুকুমার বাঙলা বা ইংরেজি ভাষায় অজ্ঞতা এখানে বড়ো কথা নয়, কিন্তু রবীন্দ্রনাথকে তাঁরা রাজসম্মান জানিয়েছিলেন তাঁর বিষয়েও তাঁরা খুব গুণাক্ষি-বাহাল ছিলেন না।

এর কারণ প্রাচ্যদেশের রবীন্দ্রনাথের খ্যাতির মূলে পাকাতা দেশের স্বীকৃতি। সাবেক পুরস্কার পাবার পর এশিয়ার বিভিন্ন দেশ তাঁকে প্রথম ভানলো — তাঁদের কাছে এটা এশিয়াবাসীর একটি বিজয়চিহ্ন। কিন্তু রবীন্দ্রনাথকে তারা ভেদেছিলেন উরোপের কাছ থেকে। এবং এটাই সত্যি যে রবীন্দ্রনাথের দূরপ্রাচ্য ভ্রমণে মানসিক আত্মনি-প্রদানের বাহন ছিলো প্রদানত ইংরেজি, যেটা ইউরোপের ভাষা।

কিন্তু যে তাঁর বইতে একটি বিষয়ে বেশি গুরুত্ব আরোপ করেছেন। জাপান ও চীন দেশে রবীন্দ্রনাথের এশিয়াতত্ত্বের প্রতিক্রিয়া বিশ্লেষণ করে তিনি দেখিয়েছেন যে লেখক-বুদ্ধিজীবী-বাস্তব-ধর্মীমনোভাবের মধ্যে গারো শিক্ষা-দীক্ষায় পাকাতা

প্রভাবিত, তাইই প্রধানত রবীন্দ্রনাথ সম্পর্কে অস্বস্তি ছিলেন, যেমন আপাদ্রোহী নোভটি, চীনের হুই চি-মো (Hau Chih-mo)। এ-থেকে হে কম্প তাঁর প্রধান বক্তব্যে পৌঁছেছেন যে আসলে তথাকথিত প্রাচ্যসংস্কৃতি খ'লে কিছু নেই — এই তথ্যটি পশ্চিমেরই অবদান। কিন্তু এ-প্রসঙ্গটির বিস্তারিত আলোচনার আগে নিম্ননি-চৈনিক প্রতিক্রিয়া বিষয়ে আরো কিছু জানা দরকার।

রবীন্দ্রনাথ যখন প্রথমবার টোকিওতে যান, তখন তাঁকে অভ্যর্থনার জন্য বিশ থেকে পঞ্চাশ হাজার নাগরিক উপস্থিত ছিলেন। আর সেই রবীন্দ্রনাথ পরবর্তী ক্ষেত্রয়ারি মাসে যখন মার্কিন যুক্ত সফর শেষ করে ইয়োকোহামায় নামলেন, তখন তাঁকে স্বাগত জানাবার জন্য এসেছিলেন শুধু ইয়োকোহামা তাইকান এবং একজন কাগজের সাংবাদিক। হুতরাং প্রথমবারের উপস্থিত দর্শকদের সবাই রবীন্দ্রসাহিত্যচর্চাশীল এমন মনে করার কোনো কারণ নেই। কেননা সেখানকার লেখক-বুদ্ধিজীবীদের রবীন্দ্রসাহিত্যের সঙ্গে কতোটা ঘনিষ্ঠ পরিচয় ছিলো, সে-তথ্যও গ্রিফেন হে তাঁর এষে বখালাধ্য বিবৃতভাবে সংকলন করেছেন। স্পষ্টই বোঝা যায়, সরকারি প্রচার এই বিপুল অভ্যর্থনার মূলে। পরবর্তী ভ্রমণে তাঁর বিষয়ে সাধারণের ঔপানীস্তের ক্ষতও দায়ী সরকারের অনাগ্রহ।

রবীন্দ্রনাথ প্রথমবার যখন টোকিও থেকে ইয়োকোহামা-য় যান, তখন কিছু প্রাবাসী চৈনিক এবং কোরীয় ছাত্রের সঙ্গে তাঁর আলাপ হয়। তাদের কাছে তিনি সাল্লাজাবাদী আপানের স্বরূপ বিষয়ে অনেক অভিজ্ঞতা লাভ করেন। ফরমোজার থাকাকালে ওধানকার প্রথম গভর্নর জেনারেল কাউন্ট কাবাইয়ামার সঙ্গেও তাঁর কথাবার্তা হয়। জটনক প্রত্যক্ষদর্শীর বিবরণ অস্বাধ্যী (গ্রিফেন হে তাঁর গ্রন্থের টীকায় জানিয়েছেন যে ইনি তাঁর নামটি গোপন রাখতে চান!) ফরমোজার শাসক-প্রধান রবীন্দ্রনাথকে নাকি বলেছিলেন যে আপানের সাহায্যে ভারত স্বাধীন হ'লে হয়তো রবীন্দ্রনাথই রাষ্ট্রপতি হবেন। রবীন্দ্রনাথ ঠা-না কিছু বলারই দরকার মনে করেননি। কী মুকুণেই রবীন্দ্রনাথ 'আপানবাজী'-তে লিখেছিলেন যে, 'যে-সব মানুষকে হস্ত দিতে পারিলে তাদেরও কিছু দেবার আছে'।

মোটের ওপর রবীন্দ্রনাথের আপান-ভ্রমণে ওয়শের প্রতিক্রিয়া যেমন অস্বস্তি ছিলো না, তেমনি তাঁর নিজের অভিজ্ঞতাও নৈরাশ্রজনক। জাপান ভেবেছিলো যে রবীন্দ্রনাথ নব্য আপানের অকুথানে অভিকৃত হবেন, তাকে এশিয়ার ভাগ্যবিধাতা ভাববেন। তা যখন হ'লো না তখন আর রবীন্দ্রনাথ সম্পর্কে সাধারণভাবে আপানের উৎসাহ রইলো না। নোগুচি একবার শেষ চেষ্টা করেছিলেন ১৯৩৮ খ্রীষ্টাব্দে আপান কর্তৃক চীন আক্রমণের সময় — এটা এশিয়ার জন্য এশিয়ার সংগ্রাম মনে করে তিনি

রবীন্দ্রনাথের সমর্থন চেষ্টাছিলেন। উত্তরে রবীন্দ্রনাথ লিখেছিলেন, 'তোমার দেশবাসী  
বাসীর আমি ভালোবাসি তাদের জন্ত সাফল্য নয়, অশ্রুতাপ (remorse) কামনা  
করি'।

অথচ রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্যবাসের অন্ততম প্রেরণা ছিলো ওকাতুরার আশ্রণ।  
ওকাতুরা ১৯০১ খ্রীষ্টাব্দে ভারতবর্ষে এসেছিলেন স্বামী বিবেকানন্দকে জাপান পরিভ্রমণের  
আমন্ত্রণ জানাবার জন্ত। স্ট্রিফেন হে রোলার 'ভারত জর্নাল'-এর সাহায্যে বলেছেন  
যে বিবেকানন্দই নাকি ওকাতুরাকে রবীন্দ্রনাথের নাম করেন। রোলি এ-কথাটা  
ওনেছিলেন ধনগোপাল মুখোপাধ্যায়ের কাছে থেকে। এ-তথ্য আমাদের কাছে চমকপ্রদ।  
যাই হোক তার পন্থেরো বছর বাদে রবীন্দ্রনাথ জাপান যাত্রা করেন এবং গিয়ে উপলব্ধি  
করেন ওকাতুরার চেয়ে ওকুমার দল অনেক বেশি প্রবল।

কনহুশিরাসের চীন নয়, কমিউনিস্ট চীন

চীনদেশে রবীন্দ্রনাথ গিয়েছিলেন আমন্ত্রিত হ'য়ে। কিন্তু সব মিলিয়ে চীন-ভ্রমণের  
অভিজ্ঞতা জাপান-ভ্রমণেরই অমূরুপ। অবশ্য চীনের রাজনৈতিক পরিস্থিতি জাপানের  
চেয়ে অনেক বেশি জটিল ছিলো — একদিকে গৃহযুদ্ধে বিধ্বস্ত, অন্যদিকে বিদেশী  
হস্তক্ষেপে বিপর্যস্ত চীনে তখন কমিউনিস্ট আন্দোলন ক্রমশ প্রবল হচ্ছে। ১৯২১  
খ্রীষ্টাব্দে পিকিং বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়ের চাকরিতে ইস্তফা দিয়ে শাংহাই-তে নবপ্রতিষ্ঠিত  
কমিউনিস্ট পার্টির প্রধান সম্পাদকের পদ গ্রহণ করেন চেন তু-হুসিউ। যে হুও যো ভো  
রবীন্দ্রনাথের জাপান ভ্রমণের সময় প্রচণ্ড রবীন্দ্রভক্ত ছিলেন এবং রবীন্দ্রনাথের কাব্য  
প'ড়ে উন্মুগ্ন হ'য়ে আত্মহত্যার সংকল্প থেকে বিরত হন, সেই তিনিই কমিউনিস্ট  
হবার পর প্রচণ্ড রবীন্দ্রবিরোধী হ'য়ে ওঠেন। তবে সবচেয়ে বিরূপ ছিলেন বোধহয়  
তরুণ ছাঁজসমাজ — তারা পুরনোকে ভেঙে নতুন সমাজ, নতুন রাষ্ট্রব্যবস্থা গড়বার  
কথা ভাবছিলেন। স্বভাবতই রবীন্দ্রনাথের অধ্যাত্মবাদ এবং প্রাচীন চৈনিক ঐতিহ্যের  
মহিমাকীর্তন তাদের ভালো লাগেনি। বিরূপ শ্রোতা ও প্রতিক্রিয়ার জন্ত রবীন্দ্রনাথ  
পিকিংয়ে ডিনাই বক্তৃতা বাতিল করেন।

স্ট্রিফেন হে দেখিয়েছেন যে রবীন্দ্রনাথের চীনসফরের সময়ও লক্ষ করা যায়  
ওয়ারাই প্রধানত অশ্রুকুল ছিলেন যারা পাকাত্য ভাবধারায় উন্মুগ্ন। চীনের ছাত্রদের  
ক্ষেত্রেও একথা প্রযোজ্য। 'জেন্সেট মুন সোসাইটি' কবির ভ্রমাদিন উপলক্ষে তাঁর  
চৈনিক নামকরণ করেন চু চেন তান। এই সভারও উদ্বোধনা ছিলেন হু-ছি-মো,  
যার উল্লেখ আগেই করা হয়েছে।

রবীন্দ্রনাথ শিকিঙ লেকচার অ্যাসোসিয়েশনের আমন্ত্রণে চীনদেশে যান ১৯২৫ খ্রিষ্টাব্দে। এর আগে এই সভার আয়োজনে ঝাং ওয়েং পরিভ্রমণ করেন তাঁদের মধ্যে ছিলেন বাট্টাও রাসেল, জন ডিউই। রবীন্দ্রনাথের আপান-ভ্রমণের সঙ্গে চীন-সফরের ব্যবধান আট বছরের। কিন্তু এর মধ্যে ঘরে-বাইরে অনেক ঘটনা ঘটে গেছে। হে-র মতে আপান থেকে প্রত্যাবর্তন কালেই রবীন্দ্রনাথের মনে বিশ্বভারতীয় পরিকল্পনার উদয় হয় (হে-র গ্রন্থ, ১২৬ পৃষ্ঠা)। তার আগে সর্বভারতীয় বিদ্যালয়ের কথা তিনি ভেবেছিলেন, কিন্তু আন্তর্জাতিক বিদ্যালয় যেখানে প্রাচ্য ও পাক্ষাত্য সংস্কৃতির সমন্বয় ঘটবে এরকম চিন্তা এই প্রথম। বিশ্বভারতীয় প্রতিষ্ঠার বছর থেকেই অসহযোগ আন্দোলনের শুরু। বিদেশী পণ্যবর্জন, চরকা ইত্যাদি বিষয় নিয়ে গাছীর সঙ্গে তাঁর বিতর্ক আজ ইতিহাসের বিষয়। রবীন্দ্রনাথ এসময়ে নিজেকে কতোটা অসহায় ভাবছিলেন তার কিছু নজির মিলবে অ্যাণ্ড্রু লেখা চিঠিপত্রে। আর চীনে যাবার আগেও রবীন্দ্রনাথের বেশ ঘিমা ছিলো এই যাত্রার সার্থকতা সম্বন্ধে। পরে অবশ্য বিড়লার অর্থাহুকূল্যে তিনি ভ্রমণসঙ্গী হিসেবে পান সংকৃত্তা কিতিমোহন সেন, শিল্পী নন্দলাল বহু এবং ঐতিহাসিক কালিদাস নাগকে। রবীন্দ্রনাথের বিশেষভ্রমণে তাঁর ভক্ত-অনুরাগীদের মধ্যে অনেকেই সহধাত্রী হতেন, কিন্তু চীনযাত্রায় একটি সংস্কৃতিক প্রতিনিধিদল গঠনের সচেতন প্রচেষ্টা ছিলো।

স্ট্রিকেন হে এই পর্বের চৈনিক ছাত্র-বুদ্ধিজীবী-লেখক-দার্শনিক-রাষ্ট্রনেতাদের বিক্রম প্রতিক্রিয়ার কারণ ও পটভূমি বিশ্লেষণ করেছেন। কিন্তু এহো বা -- এই তথ্য থেকে তিনি কী সিদ্ধান্তে এসেছেন সেটা জানা দরকার।

#### এশিয়াবাস ইজরায়েলের অবদান

রবীন্দ্রনাথের দূর প্রাচ্য-ভ্রমণ বার্ষ হয়েছিলো। তার কারণ রবীন্দ্রনাথ যে এশিয়ার আগরণের কথা ভেবেছিলেন আপানের এশিয়ার মুক্তির স্বপ্ন তা থেকে ভিন্ন। তাহলে কি রবীন্দ্রনাথ প্রচারিত প্রাচ্যবাদের কোনো ঐতিহাসিক ভিত্তি নেই? আপানের ওকাবুরা, চীনের তা-ই হ'ল প্রমুখ সবাই কি একই অলৌক স্বপ্নে বিভোর?

ত্রিভুজ হে প্রথমে শুরু করেছেন এই ব'লে যে তথাকথিত প্রাচ্য ব'লে কিছু নেই— শুভা পক্ষিমের কল্পনা। চীন আপান ভারত ইত্যাদি দেশের সংস্কৃতির মধ্যে মিলের চেয়ে অবিল অনেক বেশি। পাক্ষাত্য দেশবাসীর কাছে তাঁদের পূর্বে অবস্থিত সব দেশই প্রাচ্য। তার মানে এই নয় যে প্রাচ্যের [সাংস্কৃতিক বা ভৌগোলিক] অংশওটা সম্বন্ধে তাদের কোনো স্পষ্ট ধারণা ছিলো। কালক্রমে এই শিথিল ভেদবোধ

যুক্তিভিত্তিক হয়েছিল। ম্যাথু আর্নল্ড, কিপলিং প্রমুখের রচনাতে প্রাচ্য-পাক্ষাত্য ভাব  
 নৃপকর্মে প্রতিষ্ঠিত হলো। ভারত চীন জাপান যখন পাক্ষাত্য সংস্কৃতির সাম্প্রদায়িক  
 এলো, তখনও শেষ পর্যন্ত এই সাংস্কৃতিক সীমারেখা মেনে নিলো। অথচ পাক্ষাত্যের  
 অভিযান্ত্রিক প্রচেষ্টার এই তিনটি দেশের প্রতিক্রিয়া কতো ভিন্ন। হিন্দু তান্ত্রিক, চৈনিক  
 কনফুসিয়াস এবং নিম্ননি সামুরাই-এর দৃষ্টিভঙ্গি ও মূল্যবোধে অনেক পার্থক্য —  
 বৌদ্ধসংস্কৃতির ঐক্যাত্ম্যের মধ্যে তাদের বেধে রাখা অসম্ভব। 'আধুনিকীকরণের' তপ ও  
 সমভাও তিন দেশে আলাদা। 'জাপান পাক্ষাত্য সংস্কৃতির কাছ থেকে কী গ্রহণ করেছে?—  
 বৃটেনের কাছ থেকে নিয়েছে নৌবাহিনীর শক্তি, জর্মানির কাছ থেকে রণকৌশল  
 আর রাজতান্ত্রিক সংবিধান, ফ্রান্সের কাছ থেকে আইনকাহ্ন। ভারতে পাক্ষাত্য  
 সংস্কৃতি প্রধানত ঐতিহাসিক ঘটনাচক্রের ফল এবং স্বাধীনভাবে ভারতীয়রা যেটুকু  
 আয়ত্ত্ব করছে তা প্রযুক্তিবিজ্ঞান বা রণকৌশল নয়, শিক্ষাব্যবস্থা, কিছু সাহিত্য  
 এবং দর্শন। অল্পদিকে চীন প্রধানত নিয়েছে বিপ্লবের শিক্ষা।

জাতীয়তাবাদ বা স্ত্রানালিভম-এর চেতনাত্ত তিন দেশে আলাদা। ভারতে  
 জাতীয়তাবাদের সঙ্গে ধর্মীয় পুনর্জাগরণ ঘনিষ্ঠভাবে জড়িত, জাপানে তা সামরিক  
 বিস্তারের নামান্তর। চীনে আবার একই চেতনাত্ত সামরিক বা রাজনৈতিক বিপ্লব  
 আনে। শেষোক্ত দেশের ভূভবানী দর্শন ভারতের রবীন্দ্রনাথ বা গান্ধী কাত্তো  
 কাছেই গ্রহণীয় মনে হয়নি।

এই কারণে টিফেন হে-র কাছে কখনো অস্বাভাবিক মনে হয়নি যে রবীন্দ্রনাথ  
 তাঁর প্রাচ্যতত্ত্বকে কোনো-কোনো জায়গায় ভারতের বাণী বলেছেন। বস্ত্ত চীন বা  
 জাপানের বুদ্ধিবীর্ষরা যখন তাঁকে তাঁদের দেশে অভ্যর্থনা জানিয়েছিলেন, তখন  
 তাঁদেরও প্রত্যাশা ছিলো যে রবীন্দ্রনাথ তাঁদের দৃষ্টিতেই বিষয়টি ব্যাখ্যা করবেন।  
 কিন্তু কার্যত তা যখন হ'লো না, এলো নৈরাশ্র এবং কুল বোঝাবুঝি। বিবেকানন্দের  
 প্রাচ্যতত্ত্বের সঙ্গে নোঙচির এশিয়াবাদের মিল কোথায়?

ভুঁ জাই নয়, হে লক্ষ করেছেন যে ষাটের দশকে ভারত বা জাপানে এশিয়াবাদের  
 কথা বক্তো একটা শোনা যায় না (নেহরুর পঞ্চল নীতির পরিণতিই কি ভারতের  
 স্বনীয়ার কারণ?)। তবে চীনে এই তত্ত্বের রেশ পাওয়া যায় 'পূব হ'লো রাজ্য'  
 এই স্লোগানে। হে বলেছেন, একমাত্র ভাবীকালই বলতে পারে 'পূবের হাওয়া  
 পশ্চিমকে ভাসিয়ে নিয়ে যাবে' মাও-এর এই ঘোষণা কতদূর সত্য। অস্ত্রান্ত প্রাচ্যের  
 দেশ বিবরে হে-র বক্তব্য :

The history of other Asian societies suggests, however, that only  
 in the early stages of their development do nationalism and



pan-Asianism reinforce each other; at a later stage, as the practical demands of each particular nationalism and the territorial and ideological rivalries among national states become more intense, less and less is said about pan-continental combinations.

(ঐ পৃ ৩৩০)

হে কেবল এশিয়ার বিভিন্ন দেশের মধ্যে নয়, ভারতের বিভিন্ন নেতাদের মধ্যেও এশিয়াবাদের ধারণা সম্পর্কে বিরাট ব্যবধান লক্ষ্য করেছেন। এবিষয়ে গান্ধী রবীন্দ্রনাথ ইকবাল জহরলালের পরস্পরের দৃষ্টিভঙ্গির অনেক পার্থক্য। ঠিকেন হে তার কারণ খুঁজেছেন তাঁদের বর্ণ-শিক্ষা-ধর্ম এবং ঐতিহ্যের ভিন্নতায়। আমাদের প্রশ্ন, তাই হলে ভারতীয় ব্যাপারটিও কি অলৌকিক? হে সাহেব কি বলবেন যে তথাকথিত ভারত বলেও কিছু নেই?

ঠিকেন হে-র পদ্ধতি

আসলে ঠিকেন হে-র পদ্ধতি হুচতুর কৌশলির মতো, ঐতিহাসিকের মতো নয়। কৌশলি পূর্বনির্ধারিত বক্তব্যের সমর্থনে তথ্য উপস্থাপিত করেন আর ঐতিহাসিক তথ্য বিশ্লেষণ করে সিদ্ধান্তে হাজির হন। এই তথ্যবহুল বইয়ের প্রধান ত্রুটি হ'লো লেখক কতকগুলি লেবেল আঁটা পায়েরা গোপে রবীন্দ্রনাথ-গান্ধীকে ঢুকিয়ে দিতে চান।

তর্কের খাতিরে না-হয় যেনে নেওয়া গেলো যে রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্যভাব চীন বা জাপানে অহঙ্কল সাড়া জাগায়নি তার কারণ ঐতিহ্যের বিশিষ্টতা। কিন্তু রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্য-পাশ্চাত্য ভাব তো তাঁর বদেশবাসীও গ্রহণ করেনি। তার কারণ কি শুধু ঔপনিষদিক হিন্দু ঐতিহ্য? আর সত্যি রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্য-পাশ্চাত্য সংকীর্ণতাব্যের মূলে শুধু ঔপনিষদের প্রভাব খুঁজলে, তাঁর ওপর অবিচার করা হয়। হে নিজেই চীন দেশে প্রস্তুত রবীন্দ্রনাথের বক্তৃতা প্রসঙ্গে এক জায়গায় বলেছেন:

The uniquely spiritual character of a United Asian civilization as Tagore presented it in this lecture seemed to blend Christian, Buddhist and Hindu attitudes. (ঐ পৃ ১৫৭)

চমকপ্রদ সিদ্ধান্তের যোগে তিনি অনেক সময় মূল বক্তব্য থেকে সরে এসেছেন।  
যেমন:

In his talks to smaller groups in Peking, Tagore showed a remarkable ability to speak on themes close to the hearts

of his listeners. To the members of the Anglo-American Association he stressed the ideals of freedom and the spiritual unity of mankind; to Chinese Buddhists he spoke of the ancient days when their faith flourished both in China and in India; Faced with a large and general audience of intellectuals and students, however, he returned to the central message of Asia's spiritual civilization already expounded in his lectures in Shanghai, Hangchow and Nanking. ( ঐ পৃ ১৬২ )

রবীন্দ্রনাথ বিষয়ে ঘরে-বাইরে খতে অভিযোগই থাক, তিনি স্পষ্টভাবে বিধাগ্ৰস্ত হলেন এরকম অপবাদ কেউ দেবে না। অবশ্যে পাদ্রীর আন্দোলনের বিরুদ্ধে যের প্রকাশই হোক অথবা ব্রিটিশ সরকারের সাম্রাজ্যবাদী নীতির বিরুদ্ধে প্রতিবাদেই থাক, তিনি ছিলেন নিঃশঙ্ক। অন্তর্দিকে বিদেশে ভাপানের মাটিতে পাড়িয়ে তিনি গানের সমালোচনা করেছেন, চীনের প্রতিকূল শ্রোতৃমণ্ডলীর মধ্যেও নিজের বক্তব্য রাখেন। এসব খবর তো হে-র বই পড়েই জানা যায়। তবু ওপরে উদ্ধৃত ভাষাতে এরকম একটা ইঙ্গিত আছে যেন রবীন্দ্রনাথ বিশেষ-বিশেষ গোষ্ঠীতে মন দিতে কথা বলতেন। আর যদি সত্যি তাই হয়, তাহ'লে রবীন্দ্রনাথের বাণী নিয়ে কেন এই পণ্ডিত্য? আসলে হে রবীন্দ্রনাথের মানব-সত্যতা বিষয়ে ধারণাটা সামগ্রিকভাবে চার করেননি। তাহ'লে দেখতে পেতেন রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রধান কথা হ'লো সমন্বয়। এই সমন্বয়ের জন্তই তিনি খ্রীষ্ট, বৌদ্ধ, ইসলাম ইত্যাদি সব ধর্মের মধ্য থেকেই অনেক কিছু গ্রহণ করেছেন।

হে অবশ্য রবীন্দ্রনাথের প্রাচ্যবাদের উৎস বিষয়ে নিজেই মনস্থির করতে পারেননি। যেহেতু তাঁর মনে হয়েছে এর মূলে আছে 'হিন্দু-বৌদ্ধ ঐতিহ্য' ( পৃ ৩০১, ৩১১ ), যেহেতু মনে হয়েছে 'ঔপনিষদিক ভাষা' ( পৃ ৩১৫ )। আবার উপসংহারে তাঁকে লক্ষ্য কথা বলতে চানি :

"My religion," he (Tagore) explained to Albert Einstein during their 1930 conversation at Einstein's home near Berlin, "is in the reconciliation of the Super-Personal Man, the universal human spirit, in my own individual being." The manner by which he arrived at this reconciliation, however, insofar as it depended on achieving mutuality with other men, appears less Hindu than Judeo-Christian-Islamic, perhaps also Confucian — or simply as human, beyond all other categories.

টা পড়ে মনে হয় কবির ভ্রমণ ব্যর্থ নয়, আসলে হে-র পরিচয় বৃদ্ধা।

হেঁ সমসাময়িক ভারতীয় মনীষী, রাজনৈতিক নেতা, কবি-সাহিত্যিককে এখনভাবে ধর্ম-বর্ণের পটভূমিতে মূল্যায়ন করেছেন যে হিন্দু মহাসভার নেতারাও হার মানবেন। চিন্তরঞ্জন দাশের জাতীয়তাবাদ বৈষ্ণবীধরনের, হুত্রাঙ্গ্য ভারতীয় শৈবধর্মী এবং গান্ধীর হ'লো জৈন প্রভাবিত। শুধু নেতাদের নয়, রবীন্দ্র ভক্ত-অহুহুগীদেরও জাতি-ধর্ম বিশ্লেষণ করা হয়েছে। লেখক বেশ দূরত্বের সঙ্গে বলেছেন যে, এটা মোটেই কাকতালীয় ব্যাপার নয় যে দক্ষিণ ভারতে রবীন্দ্র-অহুহুগীদের মধ্যে অধিকাংশই ছিলেন ব্রাহ্মণ।

গান্ধী-রবীন্দ্রনাথের দৃষ্টিভঙ্গির পার্থক্যের মধ্যেও হেঁ ধর্মীয় ও বর্ণগত বাতস্ত্য লক্ষ্য করেছেন। বস্তুত মাকে-মাকে তাঁর লেখা পড়লে সন্দেহ হয় যে এশিয়াবাদ তো হুঁরর কথা জাতীয়তাবাদ বিষয়েও প্রদেশভেদে বর্ণভেদে ব্যক্তিভেদে একেবাক্যনের একেবাক্য ধারণা। এভাবে এগোতে-এগোতে শেষ পর্যন্ত দেখা যাবে যে রবীন্দ্রনাথকে বড়ো জোর ঠাকুর-পরিবারের প্রতিনিধি বলা যায়। তাতেও হয়তো অসুবিধা আছে। কেননা ঠাকুর পরিবারের একটি শাখা তো আবার হিন্দু।

ধর্ম ছাড়া নৃতাত্ত্বিক বিশ্লেষণও আছে। যেমন রবীন্দ্রনাথের দূর-প্রাচ্য-ভ্রমণে বাঙালিদের উৎসাহের অন্ততম কারণ হ'লো ভারতীয়দের মধ্যে বাঙালিরা নাকি একেবারে পূর্বপ্রান্তের অধিবাসী এবং তাদের মধ্যে মোঙ্গলীয় প্রভাব সবচেয়ে বেশি (পৃ ৩০৭) ! হেঁ বোধহয় অসমিয়া এবং আসামের অন্তর্গত উপজাতিদের কথা ভুলে গেছেন। না হ'লে তিনি লিপিবেন কেন :

"And, as a people inhabiting the easternmost major province in India, with a considerable Mongoloid strain in their genetic inheritance, Bengalis were closest to the Chinese and Japanese, both geographically and racially. This gave them all the more reason to be grateful to Tagore for his efforts to link them with the easternmost lands of Asia".

যে-রবীন্দ্রনাথ বিশেষে প্রাচ্যবাদী ব'লে পরিচিত ছিলেন, ঐ দেশে তিনিই আবার পাকিস্তানদেয়া ব'লে নিন্দিত হয়েছেন। আপাতভাবে এর মধ্যে দৃষ্টিভঙ্গির বৈপরীত্য লক্ষ্য করা যায়। কিন্তু অল্প অহুহুরণ এবং সংকীর্ণ জাতীয়তাবাদ — রবীন্দ্রনাথ দুয়েরই বিপক্ষে ছিলেন।

যে-র প্রভাব খোঁজা বাস্তবিক বড়ো মাধ্যমিক। তিনি জানিয়েছেন যে 'গোরা' (এই উপজাতিটির তিনি ইংরেজি নামকরণ করেছেন PALEFACE!) নাকি কিপলিঙের

কিন্তু এই ব্যঙ্গরূপে লেখা! ততঃ কিম্বা বাই হোক, এতো করেও তিনি শেষ পর্যন্ত রবীন্দ্র-কবির উৎস সন্ধানে কোনো স্থির সিদ্ধান্তে আসতে পারেননি। ইকবাল যে-অর্থে ইসলামি ঐতিহ্যে মানবতাবাদী, সেট অর্থে রবীন্দ্রনাথকে ঔপনিষদিক ব্রাহ্মণ্য সংস্কৃতির প্রতিনিধি বললে উত্তরের প্রতিই অবিচার করা হয়। রবীন্দ্রনাথ যখন ভারতের অধ্যাত্মবাদ বিষয়ে গুরুত্ব আরোপ করেন, তখন তাঁর উদ্দেশ্য হিন্দুধর্ম প্রচার নয়, একটি ঐতিহাসিক ভাষায় প্রতি সৃষ্টি আকর্ষণ। মনে রাখা দরকার যে তিনি কোনো পেশাদার প্রচারক ছিলেন না। হে-র বই পড়েই জানতে পারি যে রবীন্দ্রনাথের জাপান-চীন ভ্রমণের একমাত্র উদ্দেশ্য বাণী প্রচার নয়। তিনি বেড়াতে ভালোবাসতেন, এক জায়গায় বেশি দিন থাকলেই তিনি অস্থির হয়ে উঠতেন। দেশের রাজনৈতিক পরিস্থিতিতে নিঃসহতা, বিদেশের মাহুকে জানবার আকাঙ্ক্ষাও একেজো উপেক্ষীয় নয়। রামমোহনের বিশেষজ্ঞার অভিজ্ঞায় ছিলো কিছুটা বৈয়াক্য ও রাজনৈতিক এবং অনেকটা ধর্মীয় : কেশবচন্দ্র-বিবেকানন্দের ক্ষেত্রে পুরোটাট ধর্মীয় ; রাসবিহারী দত্ত-র, এম. এন. রায় হুদাচন্দ্র-ব্রহ্মরালালের উদ্দেশ্য একেবারে রাজনৈতিক। রবীন্দ্রনাথের বিশেষ-ভ্রমণের কারণ সম্পর্কে বলা হ'য়ে থাকে সাংস্কৃতিক। কিন্তু আমার মনে হয় যে তাঁর এই সাংস্কৃতিক ভূমিকাটি ক্রিষ্ণ অতিরঞ্জিত। তাঁর ভ্রমণের বায়ভার গ্রহণ করতেন দাম্যভবিত্ত বিদেশী কোনো সংস্থা। ফলে বক্তৃতা তাঁকে দিতেই হ'তো এবং এই দ্বয় বক্তৃতায় তিনি তাঁর মতামত প্রকাশ করতেন। বাট্রাও রাসেল যখন বিদেশে বক্তৃতা করতেন, তখন কেউ বলেননি যে তা হ'লো বুটেনের বাণী। কিন্তু রবীন্দ্রনাথকে দ্বয় সময়ে ভারতের সঙ্গে একাত্ম করা হ'তো। এটা কবির ব্যক্তিগতভাবে কতখানি অভিজ্ঞেজ ছিলো বলা মুশকিল। কেননা বিদেশের মতো স্বদেশেও রবীন্দ্রনাথের গ্রাচ্য-পাচ্চ্যতা তত্ত্ব বিশেষ সাদা জাগায়নি। এমন কি চীন-জাপানে তিনি কতখানি বিতৃপ্ত অভ্যর্থনা পেয়েছিলেন, সে-বিষয়েও দেশের মাহু সব সময়ে গুরুত্বহীন। রবীন্দ্রনাথের চীন-সফরের পর ১৯২৪ খ্রীষ্টাব্দে অমৃতবা তার পত্রিকার ১৯ জুলাই লখ্যায় যে-সম্পাদকীয় বেরিয়েছিলো, তার মূল কথা হ'লো এই : 'রবীন্দ্রনাথের চীন-ভ্রমণের পর তাঁকে আমরা স্বদেশে স্বাগত জানাই। ওদেশে তিনি যে-ঐশ্বর্য ও দাখ্য অর্জন করেছেন, তা আমাদের পক্ষে গৌরবের। একদা ভারত চীন এবং জাপানকে দিয়েছিলো তাদের ধর্ম এবং রুষ্টি। বর্তমান দৈবের মধ্যেও ভারত এমন একজন স্থলস্থানকে পাঠিয়েছেন, যার প্রভাবে তারা তাদের মূল ঐতিহ্য বিষয়ে পুনরায় সচেতন হ'তে পেরেছে'। বলা বাহুল্য এই উদ্ধৃতির কোনো বাস্তবভিত্তি নেই। তেমনি আবার হে-র গ্রন্থে সংকলিত চীনা জাপানি প্রতিক্রিয়া পড়ে মনে হয় তাঁদেরও রবীন্দ্রনাথের ভ্রমণের উদ্দেশ্য সম্পর্কে সঠিক ধারণা ছিলো না। সেজন্য তাঁর

সবর প্রসঙ্গে যত্নসহ করা হয়েছিলো, 'He (Rabindranath) had no *vici* to add to that *veni* and *vidi* when he took his departure.'

হ্যাঁ, রবীন্দ্রনাথ যতোই বলুন তাঁর ভ্রমণের উদ্দেশ্য তীর্থযাত্রা, কিন্তু ভবীরা অতো সহজে ভোলে ন। রবীন্দ্রনাথ যদি দেখে যেতেন যে তে সাহেব তাঁর দুই প্রাচ্য-ভ্রমণের উদ্দেশ্য ও প্রতিক্রিয়া নিয়ে পাচশো পাতার মূল্যবান বই (হাথ নব্বই টাকা) লিখে ফেলেছেন, তাহ'লে হয়তো তিনি এই লাইনটি কেটে দিতেন : 'আমি চকল খে, হুন্দের পিহানী।'

### উপসংহার

পরিশেষে যে-র এখের কয়েকটি তথ্যের প্রতি দৃষ্টি-আকর্ষণ করছি :

১. বিবেকানন্দের জন্ম-মুহূর্ত সাল দেখা আছে, ১৮৬২-১৯০২ খ্রী (পৃ ২৫) এবং রামকৃষ্ণের ১৮৩৭-১৮৮৬ খ্রী। বসন্ত বিবেকানন্দ ও রামকৃষ্ণের জন্মসাল স্বাক্ষরমে ১৮৬০ এবং ১৮৩৬ খ্রী। হে অন্তর নিজেই বলেছেন যে বিবেকানন্দ মাত্র উনচল্লিশ বছর বেঁচে ছিলেন।

২. ৪০ পৃষ্ঠার নিবেদিতার প্রথম কলকাতায় আগমনের বছর বলা হয়েছে ১৮৯৯ খ্রীষ্টাব্দে। অথচ ৪২ পৃষ্ঠায় আছে যে, রবীন্দ্রনাথের সঙ্গে নিবেদিতার প্রথম সাক্ষাৎ হয় কলকাতায় ১৮৯৮ খ্রীষ্টাব্দে।

পোঁয়া-র ইংরেজি ভরজমা কি 'Paleface'? এবিষয়ে অবশ্য আগেই বলা হয়েছে। ১১৩ পৃষ্ঠায় আছে যে, 'So great was Toyama's influence that the government had to apologize to the British Ambassador for not daring to send police into Toyama's house to extradite Bose.' এই কথা কিন্তু ঠিক নয়। তোয়ামা-র বাড়ির বাগান খানাতলাশি করা হয়েছিলো (জ. Oshama প্রণীত *Two Great Indians in Japan*, 1954, পৃ ৩৮)।

৩. ৪৫০ পৃষ্ঠায় বলা হয়েছে যে রাসবিহারী বহু জাপানি কলকাতা বিশ্ববিদ্যালয়ের পর বাকি জীবনটা রেভারেন্ডার মালিক হিসেবে কাটিয়ে দেন। বসন্ত রাসবিহারী বহু স্বাভাবিক ভারতবর্ষের স্বাধীনতা আন্দোলনের সঙ্গে যুক্ত ছিলেন। জাভান হিন্দু বাহিনীর অন্ততম প্রতিষ্ঠাতা তিনি।

আমি ভেবেছিলাম যে আমার এই সমালোচনার নাম দেবো 'দুরাকাজ্জের স্বাভ্রমণ'। কিন্তু যত্নসহ ঠিক করতে পারলাম না যে স্বাভ্রমণটা কার—রবীন্দ্রনাথের না রিকেন-দে-র।

—সুবীর রায়চৌধুরী

# WORKS OF RABINDRANATH TAGORE : ENGLISH

*Continued from the previous issue*

Compiled by PULINBHABI SEN and SODHANLAL GANGULI

assisted by JAGADINDRA BHRAUMIK

IN THE CONTENTS, with regard to the poetry volumes, the first line shows the first line of the poem in English with its title where there is one, and the second line shows the first line of the corresponding piece in Bengali with its title again where there is one. The title of the volume where the poem occurs is given against each line on the right.

With regard to the prose volumes, the corresponding title of a piece in Bengali is also given followed by the title of the book in which it occurs. All the short stories are now to be found in one collected edition, *Galpaguchchha* ; this has not been indicated separately against each short story.

As Tagore points out in his preface to *The Gardener*, his "translations are not always literal—the originals being sometimes abridged and sometimes paraphrased". In fact, on occasions, he has used more than one poem for a single translation. All this renders identification of the originals difficult in some cases, and the compilers will be grateful if imperfections in this respect, or otherwise, are brought to their notice.

Measurements are in inches.

THE CRESCENT MOON / BY / RABINDRANATH TAGORE / TRANSLATED  
FROM THE ORIGINAL BENGALI / BY THE AUTHOR / WITH EIGHT ILLUSTRATIONS

CTIONS / IN COLOUR / MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED / ST. MARTIN'S STREET,  
LONDON / 1913

8 x 6; pp. xii, 82, [2]: comprising half-title, Macmillan's monogram and addresses on verso, pp. [i-ii]; title, notice of copyright on verso, pp. [iii-iv]; dedication "To T. Sturge Moore", verso blank, pp. [v-ii]; contents, pp. [vii]-ix; list of coloured illustrations at foot of p. ix, verso blank; index of the first lines, pp. [xi]-xii; text, pp. 1-82; imprint "Glasgow, Printed at the University Press by Robert Maclehose and Co. Ltd." at foot of p. 82; list of books by Rabindranath Tagore, pp. [1-2], these two pages not included in pagination.

Issued in blue cloth, lettered in gold on front cover and spine; the front having a design by S. M. [Sturge Moore], showing a child and the crescent moon, also printed in gold.

Illustrations are by Surendranath Ganguli, Abanindranath Tagore and Nandalal Bose.

### Contents

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. <i>The Home</i> : I paced alone   |                   |
| <i>Saisab Sandhya</i> : Dhire dhire bistariche                             | <i>Sonar Tari</i> |
| 2. <i>On the Seashore</i> : On the seashore of endless worlds <sup>1</sup> |                   |
| <i>Jagatparabarar tire chhelera kare mela</i>                              | <i>Sisu</i>       |
| 3. <i>The Source</i> : The sleep that flits on baby's eyes <sup>2</sup>    |                   |
| <i>Khoka</i> : Khokar chokhe ye ghum ase                                   | <i>Sisu</i>       |
| 4. <i>Baby's Way</i> : If baby only wanted to, he could fly                |                   |
| <i>Chaturl</i> : Amar khoka kare go yadi manē                              | <i>Sisu</i>       |
| 5. <i>The Unheeded Pageant</i> : Ah, who was it coloured that              |                   |
| <i>Khela</i> : Tomar Katitater dhati                                       | <i>Sisu</i>       |
| 6. <i>Sleep-Stealer</i> : Who stole sleep from baby's eyes                 |                   |
| <i>Ghumchora</i> : Ke nilo khokar ghum hariya                              | <i>Sisu</i>       |
| <i>The Beginning</i> : Where have I come from                              |                   |
| <i>Janmakatha</i> : Khoka make sudhay deke                                 | <i>Sisu</i>       |
| 8. <i>Baby's World</i> : I wish I could take a quiet corner                |                   |
| <i>Khokar Rajya</i> : Khokar maner thik majhkhantite                       | <i>Sisu</i>       |

<sup>1</sup> Published before in GITANJALI (no. 60) with a slight difference: GITANJALI, "Ships get wrecked"; THE CRESCENT MOON, "ships are wrecked".

<sup>2</sup> Published before in GITANJALI (no. 60) with the following difference: GITANJALI "find buds of enchantment"; THE CRESCENT MOON, "shy buds of enchantment".

9. *Play and Why* : When I bring you coloured toys<sup>3</sup>  
*Kena Madhur* Rangin khelena dile o ranga hate
10. *Defamation* : Why are those tears in your eyes  
*Apayas* : Bachha re tor chokshe kena jal
11. *The Judge* : Say of him what you please  
*Vichar* : Amar khokar kata ye dosh
12. *Playthings* : Child, how happy you are sitti  
*Nirlipta* : Bachha re mor bachha
13. *The Astronomer* I only said, "When in the evening  
*Jyotish Sastra* Ami sudhu balechhilem *Sisu*  
*Clouds and Waves* Mother, the folk who live up in the clouds  
*Mattrivatsal* Megher madhye ma go yara thake *Sisu*
15. *The Champa Flower* Supposing I became a champa flower  
*Lukochuri* Ami yadi dushtumi kare
16. *Fairyland* : If people came to know where my king's place is  
*Rajar Badi* Amar rajar badi kothay *Sisu*  
*The Land of the Exile* : Mother, the light has grown grey  
*Chhutir Dine* Oi dekho ma akas chheye
18. *The Rainy Day* : Sullen clouds are gathering fast  
*Ashadh* : Nil nabaghane ashadh-gagane *Kshani*
19. *Paper Boats* Day by day I float my paper boats  
*Kagaj Nauka* Chhuti hale roj bhasai jale
20. *The Sailor* : The boat of the boatman Madhu  
*Naukayatra* : Madhu majhir oi ye naukakhana *Sisu*
21. *The Further Bank* I long to go over there  
*Majhi* Amar yete ichchha kare
22. *The Flower School* When storm clouds rumble in the sky  
*Baijnanik* : Yemni ma go guruguru *Sisu*
23. *The Merchant* Imagine, mother  
*Dukkhahari* Mane karo tumi thakbe ghare  
*Sympathy* : If I were only a little puppy  
*Samabyathi* Yadi khoka na haye

... 3 Published before in GITANJALI (no. 62) with the following differences :

- i. GITANJALI, "When I bring you" THE CRESCENT MOON, "When I bring you".
- ii. GITANJALI, "what the pleasure is that streams" ; THE CRESCENT MOON, "what pleasure streams".
- iii. GITANJALI, "what delight that is which the summer breeze brings" ; CRESCENT MOON, "what delight the summer breeze brings".



25. *Location* : When the gong sounds ten  
*Vichitra Sadh* : Ami yakhan pathaalate yai Sisu
26. *Superior* : Mother, your baby is silly  
*Vijna* : Khuki tomar kichchhu bojhe na ma Sisu
27. *The Little Big Man* : I am small because I am a little child  
*Chhoto Baḍo* : Ekhanō to baḍo hai ni ami Sisu
28. *Twelve O'Clock* : Mother, I do want to leave off my lessons  
*Prasna* : Ma go, amay chhuti dite bal Isu
29. *Authorship* : You say that father writes a lot of books  
*Samalochak* : Baba naki bai lekhe sab nije
30. *The Wicked Postman* : Why do you sit there on the floor  
*Byakul* : Aman kare achhis kena ma go
31. *The Hero* : Mother, let us imagine we are travelling  
*Bir Purush* : Mane karo yena bides ghure Sisu
32. *The End* : It is time for me to go, mother  
*Viday* : Tabe ami yai go tabe yai
33. *The Recall* : The night was dark when she went away  
*Akul Ahvhan* : Sāndhe hala griha andhakara<sup>4</sup>
34. *The First Jasmines* : Ah, these jasmines  
*Snehasmriti* : Sei champa sei bel phul
35. *The Banyan Tree* : O you shaggy-headed banyan tree  
*Purono Bat* : Lutiye pade jatil jata
36. *Benediction* : Bless this little heart  
*Asirvad* : Ihader karo asirvad
37. *The Gift* : I want to give you somethi  
*Upahar* : Sneha-upahar ene dite chai Sisu
38. *My Song* : This song of mine  
*Mangalagit* : Amar e gan ma go
39. *The Child Angel* : They clamour and fight  
*Mangalagit* : Eta baḍo e dharani mahasindhu ghera Sisu
40. *The Last Bargain* : "Come and hire me"  
 Ke nibi go kine amay

4 The translation begins at the third stanza ("Andhar rate chalo geli tui").

5 Only one stanza ("ananter majkhane") has been used. This is the concluding stanza of the translation.

CHITRA / *(in red)* / BY / RABINDRANATH TAGORE / A PLAY  
IN ONE ACT / *[fleur-de-lis, in red]* / PUBLISHED BY THE INDIA  
SOCIETY / LONDON / 1913

11 x 5½; pp. [2], X, 36: comprising one blank leaf not included in pagination, pp. [1-2] ; half-title, bibliographical note, "Five hundred copies of his edition have been printed for the INDIA SOCIETY of which two hundred and fifty copies only are for sale", on verso, pp. [i-ii] ; title, notice of copyright on verso, pp. [iii-iv] ; dedication, "To Mrs William Maughn Moody", verso blank, pp. [v-vi] ; preface, pp. vii-viii; list of characters, verso blank, pp. ix-[x]; text, pp. 1-34 ; imprint, Chiswick Press : Charles Whittingham and Co., Tooks Court, Chancery Lane, London, verso blank, pp. [35-36]

Issued in white linen, lettered in gold on front cover and on spine.

Translated from *Chitrangada* (1892), a drama, by the author. The unsigned Preface was contributed by Ramananda Chatterjee.<sup>6</sup>

THE KING / OF / THE DARK CHAMBER / BY / RABINDRANATH  
TAGORE / TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH / BY THE AUTHOR /  
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED / ST. MARTIN'S STREET,  
LONDON / 1914

7½ x 5; pp. iv, 200, 2 comprising half-title, Macmillan's monogram and addresses appearing on verso, pp. [i-ii], title, notice of copyright on verso, pp. [iii-iv]; text, pp. [1]-200; the imprint, Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited, Edinburgh, appearing at the foot of p. 200; advertisement of books by Rabindranath Tagore, pp. [1-2], these last two pages being numbered at foot.

Issued in blue cloth with front cover and spine lettered in gold. All edges untrimmed.

A t

<sup>6</sup> See Rabindranath Tagore's letter to Ramananda Chatterjee, *n.d.*, *The Prabasi, Aggrahayana* 1348 B.E. and Ramananda Chatterjee's editorial note on the subject in the same issue.

Translated by K. C. Sen. The translation is erroneously attributed to the author in the title page.<sup>7</sup>

The songs are translated by the author, with the possible exception of the following two which are in the handwriting of the translator:

Do you smile, my friends

What will of thine is this

Published in *The Drama*, May 1914 (The Drama League of America, Chicago).

#### LIST OF SONGS<sup>8</sup>:

1. The southern gate is unbarred  
Aji dakhina duar khola
2. We are all Kings in the kingdom of our King  
Amra sabai raja amader ei rajar rajutve
3. My beloved is ever in my heart p. 21  
Amar praner manush achhe prane
4. Do you smile, my friends p. 37  
Tora ye ya balis bhai
5. Open your door, I am waiting  
Kholo kholo dvar

---

<sup>7</sup> Tagore writes to William Rothenstein:

Shantiniketan, 8th July 1914

I was rather surprised to receive from Macmillans copies of *The King of the Dark Chamber*. I had no idea that they were going to bring it out so soon and I was not prepared for it. The manuscript that you had with you was the first draft and in the later ones the translation had undergone such a vast deal of alterations that it is quite a different thing now. So I was rather put out at the sudden appearance of this book . . . but it cannot be helped. But the worst of it is that I am not the translator—it was an Indian student, Kshitish Chandra Sen, who translated it for me. I have cabled to Macmillans to make correct announcement—please see that it is done properly. It places me in a very awkward situation with Mr. Sen.

—From a photograph copy in the collection of Rabindra-Sadan, Santiniketan.

Several typescripts of *The King of the Dark Chamber* [with] further revisions by the author are in the collection of the Rabindra-Sadan, Santiniketan.

<sup>8</sup> The original Bengali book contains as many as twenty-two songs in the first edition (and twenty-six in the second), of which thirteen have been used in this English version.



6. ~~At~~ breath you can remove my veils  
 Eke mor abaran
7. ~~As~~ they would fly away p. 57  
 Kotha baire dure yay re ude
8. ~~We~~ have nothing, indeed  
 Moder kichhu nai re nai
9. My sorrow is sweet to me  
 Viraha madhur holo  
 All blacks and whites have lost their distinction p. 90  
 Ya chhila kalo dhalo  
 With you is my game, love p. 91  
 Aha, tomar sange praner khela
12. What will of thine is this that sends me afar  
 Amare tumi kiser chhale
13. I am waiting with my all  
 Ami sakal niye bose achhi

Tagore wrote to C. F. Andrews (13 November 1914)

Critics and detectives are naturally suspicious. They scent allegories where there are no such abominations. It is difficult to convince them of our innocence.

With regard to the criticism of my play, *The King of the Dark Chamber*, that you mention in your letter, the human soul has its inner drama, which is just the same as anything else that concerns Man, and *Sudarshana* is not more an abstraction than Lady Macbeth, who might be described as an allegory representing the criminal ambition in man's nature. However, it does not matter what things are, according to the rules of the critics. They are what they are, and therefore difficult of classification.\*

THE POST OFFICE A PLAY BY RAB-/INDRANATH TAGORE  
 TRANSLAT-/ED BY DEVABRATA MUKHERJEA / [design, a girl  
 standing under a tree] / THE CUALA PRESS / CHURCHTOWN /  
 DUNDRUM / MCMXIV

11x5½; pp. [xii], 38, 6 comprising seven blank pages not included in

9 Rabindranath Tagore, *Letters to a Friend* (London, 1928)

pagination, pp. [i-vii], publisher's note of limitation notice, "Four hundred copies of this book have been printed. This copy is No.," p. [viii]; title, verso blank, pp. [ix-x]; p. [xi] blank; preface by W. B. Yeats, printed in red, p. [xii]; text, pp. 1-[38]; six blank pages not included in pagination. Imprint (in red), "Printed and Published by Elizabeth C. Yeats at the Cuala Press, Churchtown, Dundrum, in the County of Dublin, Ireland", at foot of p. [38]. Finished on Saint John's Eve in the year nineteen hundred and fourteen.

Issued in blue paper boards, white cloth spine, lettered in black on front cover.

Translated from *Dakghar* (1912).

Published on July 27, 1914.

First published in *The Forum*, March 1914 (New York).<sup>1</sup>

Tagore writ to C. F. Andrews:

BERLIN 4 June,

I saw Post Office acted in a Berlin theatre. The girl who took the part of Amal was delightful in her acting, and altogether the whole thing was a success. But it was a different interpretation from that of ours in our own acting in Vichitra. I had been trying to define the difference in my mind, when Dr. Otto of Marburg University, who was among the audience, hit upon it. He said that the German interpretation was suggestive of a fairy-story, full of elusive beauty, whereas the inner significance of this play is spiritual.

I remember, at the time when I wrote it, my own feeling which inspired me to write it. Amal represents the man whose soul has received the call of the open road—he seeks freedom from the comfortable enclosure of habits sanctioned by the prudent and from walls of rigid opinion built for him by the respectable. But Madhab, the worldly-wise, considers his restlessness to be the sign of a fatal malady; and his adviser, the physician, the custodian of conventional platitudes—with his quotations from prescribed text-books full of maxims—gravely nods his head and says that freedom is unsafe and every care should be taken to keep the sick man within walls. And so the precaution is taken.

But there is the post office in front of his window, and Amal waits

<sup>10</sup> We have not seen a complete copy, and are indebted to Sri Sujit Mukherjee, *Passage to America*, p. 40, fn. 38 for this information.

for the king's letter to come to him direct from the king, bringing to him the message of emancipation. At last the closed gate is opened by the king's own physician, and that which is "death" to the world of hoarded wealth and certified creeds brings him awakening in the world of spiritual freedom:

The only thing that accompanies him  
of love given to him by Sudha.

I know the value of this love, and therefore my petition to the Queen was:

"Let me be the gardener of thy flower garden"—the gardener, whose only reward is daily to offer his garlands to the Queen.

Do you think that Post Office has some meaning at this time for my country in this respect, that her freedom must come direct from the King's Messenger, and not from the British Parliament; and that when her soul awakes nothing will be able to keep her within walls? Has she received her letter yet from the King?<sup>11</sup>

## WORKS OF RABINDRANATH TAGORE : ENGLISH

*Appendices*

## TAGORE ON HIS OWN TRANSLATIONS

In order to explain the difficulty in identifying the originals we have reproduced in the introductory note the following lines from Tagore's preface to *The Gardener*: "[My] translations are not always literal—the original being sometimes paraphrased." The following two letters from Tagore to Ajitkumar Chakravarti, written in 1913, when Tagore had taken up further translation work after *Gitanjali*, explain this further.

Sri Kshitri Roy has kindly translated for us these letters from the original Bengali.

*is, U.S.A., 13 March 1913*

...At Urbana, my mornings are given to writing out my discourses and the evenings to the translation of my poetry.

The subject of my next discourse is The Problem of Self. At my lecture in Boston, certain members of the audience raised a question. "In your search for salvation," they pointed out, "you wish to obliterate your self-hood altogether. Now, tell us what are your own views on the subject." I told them in reply, "I would rather not waste time trying to answer that question extempore. I shall put down my views in writing." So I have to sit down to do the writing, and, what is more, before I take my leave of this country, I must read it out to my Boston audience. It occurs to me that if I could but put down my thoughts in clear terms, they might find the ideas new and interesting.

Be that as it may, what I like best is when I do my own poems into English. I find the task gripping to the point of intoxication. In the act of translating into an alien tongue, I seem to find a new flavour in what I had written originally in Bengali. It is almost like the bride's reception at her husband's home—after the wedding is over. By that time the two have already been united in holy wedlock. But the bride must meet and make friends with the community to which she must belong henceforth. Only after the assembled guests partake joyfully of the feast from the bride's hand, her union with the husband receives the society's sanction. When I wrote originally in Bengali, it was merely a poet's wedding with his Muse. Or, in other words, I did not have any clearly

defined objective before me other than my poetry. Now that I have got down to translating my poetry into English, it is like sending forth an invitation to every one to partake of the feast from my bride's hand. Therefore, the flavour of this joy is somewhat different from what it was before. My mind is kept fully occupied with the enthusiasm of laying preparations for this ritual feast. Over and over again, I keep on chopping and paring, scrubbing and scouring—as if there is no end of things waiting to be attended to.

Here, no one is prepared to accept my translations as translations. They are not prepared to concede that my poetry was originally written in Bengali and that the original could be better than the present English version. I cannot dismiss their contention as absolutely baseless or irrelevant. The fact is, one cannot really and truly render one's thoughts into another language. One of the reasons why this is so, is because my right to my own writing is my author's undisputed right—and not something super-imposed. If it were otherwise, I would have been answerable for each and every Bengali word of which the meaning or value deviates in the translation. But I do not hold myself answerable in that rigid manner. What I try to capture in my English translation is the heart and core of my original Bengali. That is bound to make for a fairly wide deviation. *If I were not there to help you out, you might probably find it impossible to identify the original in the translation.*<sup>1</sup> For one thing, the original Bengali has shrunk to a considerable extent in the translation. That, to my mind, is only natural. In her Bengali garb, my Muse has to make her appearance bedecked with all the finery and splendour that the resources of the language can command. She is like the newly-wed bride about to enter the 'public' domain of her in-law's household. How can she help parading the magnificence of her paternal dower? But, suppose she has to voyage to a far-away land on her honeymoon; unless she discards the major part of her ornaments and jewellery, these may well prove a burdensome incumbrance. Or, suppose she was to go out on a pilgrimage. In that case she must travel light and not trundle her trousseau about. Shimmering silk and glittering jewels would hardly prove appropriate for such an occasion.

I have, therefore, assigned myself the task of dis-adorning my Muse. The traditional symbols of her marital status—the vermillion mark at the parting of her hair and the simple iron bangle—are still there. Nor has

<sup>1</sup> Italics compilers'.



she been converted into a be-gowned memsahib as soon as she stepped into her train compartment. How can a Bengali bride cast off her bridal veil! Only, the surfeit of ornaments has been drastically cut down to give her a new look of simplicity. Therefore, when my English readers shake their heads in violent protest and claim that this transformation cannot be construed as mere translation, I cannot lightly dismiss what they say. Translated, my Muse could at best find accommodation in some wayside inn on her sojourn abroad. She would then be always on the move, ready to return home to roost at the shortest notice. But, no, she has been made warmly welcome into their homes, not as a visiting stranger but like a friend and relation. Nor have they tried to evaluate her on the basis of her jewellery or wardrobe. They have read something in her face which they see only in the face of a blood-relation. They refuse to regard her as an outsider: 'She is our own, our kith and kin', they say. So, when they are told that she is not half as good as in her original Bengali, they get annoyed. Nor can such claim be properly substantiated. In her English version she has a grace and dignity all her own. If she acquires more of these qualities and is re-born in the process, she will have become more significant and meaningful.

As my task of translation is oriented towards this aim, I derive a creative joy afresh out of this exercise. Since there is no element of force or compulsion involved, I do not have the time for any writing other than these. Meanwhile you all make demands on me which urge no response on my part. I do realise my remissness. But, how can I help?

*London 12 May 1912*

... The forms and features of the original become difficult to trace in my translations—the way I do them these days. My translations are more a reflection than an exact replica of the original image. That becomes so because I have now given up all attempts to attune the English of my translation to the Bengali of my original—on realizing that the Bengali flute is pitched on a different key as compared with the English. But, there is another point which you must keep in mind. My English writing emerges out of my sub-conscious. Once I mount the peak of conscious will, all my wit and wisdom get muddled. That is why I cannot gird up my loins to do a translation. I can only set my boat adrift—and not

CL  
sit at the helm at all. Then,  
understand myself how

*Chitra*: A READING by RABINDRANATH

"An Indian Drama

"A Reading by MR. RABINDRA NATH TAGORE

The Indian Art, Dramatic and Friendly Society<sup>2</sup>. . . has already made several serious efforts to fulfil its professed intention of bringing the East and the West into closer touch. . . The latest of these efforts took the form of a meeting yesterday afternoon [May? 1913]<sup>3</sup>, at which Mr. Rabindranath Nath Tagore, who is described as India's "World Poet" . . . read his own translation of one of his own plays.

"Before a large and deeply interested gathering that included many Anglo-Indians and many well-known men of letters Mr. Tagore lent over his reading-desk—a tall, slim figure dressed in tight-fitting garments of black; a face with finely chiselled features and with the deep-set eyes and the high brow of the thinker; long hair and flowing beard in which grey is taking the place of black, and a strangely thin, but musical, voice. In the dusk of late afternoon the shaded light that was directed upon his manuscript was reflected in a copper glow upon his face; and he read with hardly a gesture, without a break, and in the accents of a refined Englishman from the beginning of his short prose-poem to the end. . . .

"The reading was received with enthusiasm by the audience; and the poet, a quiet, almost a shy man—was overwhelmed with compliments by the many admirers who crowded round him before he could escape from the room."

—*Westminster Gazette*

FIRST PERFORMANCE OF *The Post*

"The Abbey Theatre

"First Performance of a Tagore Play

"On Saturday evening last [ May 1913] a performance was given i

<sup>2</sup> Indian Society, according to another report. This Society, it will be recalled, first published Tagore's *Gitanjali*, *Chitra* and *One Hundred Poems of Kabir*. Tagore was elected one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society.

<sup>3</sup> The date is missing from the clipping in the Rabindra-Sadan collection of the newspapers from which this account is taken. In a letter to Jagadishchandra Bose, dated 15 May, 1913, Tagore refers to this reading as "recently given". See Rabindranath Tagore, *Chithiputra* 6, p. 61.

the Abbey Theatre [Dublin] in aid of the Building Fund of St. Edha's College, when two plays were presented to a well filled but not overcrowded house. One was "The Post Office", by Rabindranath Tagore, the great modern Bengali poet. A large amount of interest was displayed in connection with the first production in Dublin of "The Post Office", especially as an appreciative lecture delivered a couple of months ago by Mr. W. B. Yeats introduced us to this striking Eastern personality, and a recently published translation of "Song-offerings" brought many readers into closer touch with his method and genius. The company must be congratulated on the minuteness with which they "made up" for the parts. . . . The scenes were composed of Gordon Craig screens, and were arranged by Mr. J. F. Barlow. Too much praise cannot be given to Miss Lilian Iago for her impersonation of the pathetic part of Amal. Mr. Farrell Pelly was very good as the Dairyman, and Mr. Michael Conniffe as Gaffer. Mr. H. F. Hutchinson as the Watchman and Mr. Philip Guiry as Madhav showed a very fine grasp of an unusual but apparently none the less congenial task. The other characters were ably represented by Miss Nell Stewart (Sudha), Mr. Charles Power (Doctor), Mr. James Duffy (Headman), Mr. Thomas Barrett (King's Herald), and Mr. Sean Connolly (King's Physician), while the "Boys" parts were taken by Desmond Murphy, Owen Clarke, and Horace Jennings".

—*Daily Express*, 19 May 1913, from a clipping in the collection of Rabindra-Sadan, Santi iktan.

#### 4. ABOUT A PERFORMANCE OF *Chitra* IN MUNICH IN 1916

The *New York City Sun* (October 3, 1916) has the following news-item<sup>4</sup>:

Berlin October 4. [By wireless] A new play, "Chitra", By Sir Rabindranath Tagore, the British Indian poet who was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1913, was produced at the Munich Theatre for the first time, says the Overseas News Agency, and was well received by the literary critics.

The journal thought that this reception to *Chitra* savoured of politics:

"A political motive may be behind the production in Germany at this

<sup>4</sup> It was published in other American Journals also; in some evening journals on October 4.

of the Indian poet's play and its favorable reception. By this compliance the Germans may hope to further the discontent manifested by certain factions in India against Great Britain's rule.

Tagore himself, though a British Knight, is not reconciled to British lordship. . . .<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Chicago Ills. Journal* of 7 October 1916 contested the claim that this was the first performance of *Chitra*

"Berlin takes pains to wireless to this country the news of the production of Rabindranath Tagore's *Chitra* in Munich "for the first time." The semi-official German news bureau which sends the aerogram means say that this play was staged in Munich for the first time anywhere it would do well to look beyond the now somewhat extended borders of Germany for information. This play was acted in Boston by some talented uplifters of the theater as long as Feb. 8, 1915 and London saw it played in February of this year."

<sup>2</sup> *New York Dramatic Mirror* of 21 October 1916 gives further informations on this point :

"Produced here first

"The cable tells us that "Chitra had its first performance in Berlin last week. As a matter of fact, this play was produced in the United States two years ago by B. Iden Payne, with Mona Limerick in the title-role."

#### *Chitra*: STAGE DIRECTIONS

The following "note" appears in the book

The dramatic poem "Chitra" has been performed in India without scenery—the actors being surrounded by the audience. Proposals for production here having been made to the author, he went through this translation and provided stage directions, but wished these omitted if it were printed as a book.

The following directions occur in a typescript in the collection of Rabindra Sadana, Santini

"The stage should be divided in two by a raised dais parallel with the side lights and stretching from wing to wing.

<sup>5</sup> For further references on the subject, see Sujit Mukherjee, *Passage to America*, p. 76.

On it the plane of the Gods.

In front of it the mortal plane.

A dark curtain to relieve the figures is the only background desirable, scenery would be out of place. While the gods are present the mortal plane should be in a shadowy half light."

Scene I. As the Scene opens

*The Curtain discovers on the plane of the Gods Madana and Vāsanta, on the mortal plane Chitra.*

Scene I. CHITRA, as she commences the speech beginning with the words "Art thou the god" is described as *standing reverently with hands raised palm to palm and profile bent over her thumbs.*

Scene I. After CHITRA's speech "I bow to thee, Lord Vāsanta." *kneels on both knees and touches her forehead to the earth.*

Scene I. CHITRA, after the speech ending with the words "the forest temple of Shiva," *pauses confused with shame.*

Scene I. CHITRA, as she commences the speech beginning with the words "Had I but the time needed," is described as *speaking half to herself.*

At the close of Scene I: *The Curtain falls as she [CHITRA] bows to the ground in gratitude.*

Scene II. Arjuna is described as

*wrapped in reddish-brown unshaped cloak of an ascetic.*

At the close of Scene II:

*The Curtain falls before his [ARJUNA'S] rest by a gesture.*

Scene III: As the Scene opens, CHITRA is described as *discovered alone.*

At the close of Scene III: *Curtain.*

At the close of Scene IV:

*The Curtain falls before the effect of the last words as [is] apparent.*

At the close of Scene VI:

*The Curtain falls before the success or failure of CHITRA'S appeal has become apparent.*

At the close of Scene VIII:

*The Curtain descends before it is apparent whether she [CHITRA] will be consoled or not.*

Directions retained in the published version have not been in

Rabindranath Tagore wrote to C. Kingsley  
mance of *Chitra*:

It that I can suggest about the performance of Chitra is that, instead of having any painted scenery at all, only a blue curtain for background can be used. There should be a raised platform in the rear for the scenes where Madan appears. The lights will be concentrated upon that part when it is used and shifted to the front part when other scenes are being acted. Chitra being a lyrical drama it depends more for the effectiveness of its representation upon the imaginative and emotional fervour of the acting than upon anything extraneous. Judicious employment of coloured lights will add to its effect. •

I

*About this and future numbers of our journal*

We regret that owing to unprecedented circumstances beyond our control, the printing of this volume has been much behind the schedule. Normally the journal should not take more than eight weeks to print. The small University Press, however, had been printing the pages of this volume off and on since the concluding months of 1969! We therefore urge our readers and recipients of exchange copies to kindly bear with us. The next number, Vol. 10, will be printed by an off-campus press before the end of March, 1972. We assure you, we will keep our commitment.

We take this opportunity to announce that printing with Vol. 10 JJCL will be a priced publication. The exchange arrangements will not be disturbed, but general readers will be expected to buy copies.

Vol. 10 of JJCL will be largely devoted to Comparative Literature in Germany and include English versions of several articles by German comparatists.

II

*Hope for Comparative Literature in this country*

Here is some good news for the comparatists in India. Backed by a grant from the University Grants Commission, senior teachers from nine southern universities came together in Madurai, in May 1970, to "reorganize the M.A. English course in tune with the change of emphasis on the role of the English language and literature in the country." Dr V. Sachithanandan of Madurai University was the director of the seminar. The participants took note of the fact that "at present there is no uniformity among the universities as regards the number and content of the papers included in the syllabus for the M.A. English course. The number of papers varies from eight to ten in the universities in the south." The seminar recommended that the syllabus should contain, apart from five/six Eng. Lit. papers (courses), at least one special paper on one of the following subjects:

American Literature  
Comparative Literature  
Indian Writing in English  
Old and Middle English

or, European Classics in Translation.

Well, even one course in Comparative Literature at the graduate level at several southern universities would be of some encouragement. The University of Mysore already has introduced two Comparative Literature courses in its M.A. English syllabus.

University of Calcutta, we understand, is also willing to let similar programmes be added to the revised M.A. English course. However, it is sad to contemplate that our department, as far as we know, remains to this day the only full department of Comparative Literature in the whole of South East Asia. Time moves very slowly indeed!

### III

#### *Comparative Literature at English universities*

At the Cambridge English Tripos, the courses on 'Tragedy', 'The Novel', and 'The English Moralists' carry a wide range of possible reading in foreign literatures; there is also one specifically comparative option in 'Petrarchism'. Further, in the new universities comparative literary studies have begun to receive some recognition as suitable for undergraduate teaching. The 'Foundation Year' at Keele, in presenting a survey of the evolution of European culture, draws literary examples from various national backgrounds. In the first year at Kent, topics like realism and naturalism are handled in a comparative manner, and even less departmentalized topics like 'The Evolution of the Novel' may use literature as evidence. At Sussex, not only are there courses on 'Tragedy' based on a variety of European texts, both ancient and modern, but also joint topics in literature and history, a 'Foundations' course combining the study of modern sociological, psychological, philosophical and literary texts in a broadly European context. Only at East Anglia has the actual term 'Comparative Literature' been adopted for an undergraduate degree course. Both East Anglia and Sussex offer an M.A. in Comparative Literature."

### IV

#### *A record.*

"The ... conventional view of literary studies is that the body of material which constitutes a degree course in a national literature for itself a natural whole, complete in itself; and that it should therefore be studied systematically from beginning to end. That this view is no more than a convention, and perhaps ultimately a self-defeating convention, is likely to become clearer with time."

"Comparative Literature was banned under Stalin, but following the 'Thaw' has developed again in all East European countries, where three international conferences on the subject have been held since 1960."

### V

#### *Mr Comparative Literature*

Three years after this discipline had been introduced at Jadavpur, Werner P. Friederich, Professor of German and Comparative Literature at the University of North Carolina, visited our department in 1959 and lectured to the students. The first number of *JJCL* had the distinction of printing one of his articles: "The Political Failure of German



Late Romanticism." From YCGL, No. 19, we now learn that this 'stalwart' of Comparative Literature, who is there referred to as Mr Comparative Literature, "retired from his duties at the end of the academic year 1969/70. He intends to do a lot of travelling with his Australian-born wife and, in general, do exactly what he wants." The students and teachers of this department would welcome him again if and when he passes through Calcutta. We are happy to learn that Horst Frenz, another friend of our department, has been named "Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature by the Trustees of Indiana University as of July 1, 1969." Professor Frenz was the only faculty member of Indiana University so honoured on that occasion. The latest book he has edited contains "a complete English version of all the presentation and acceptance speeches made in connection with the Nobel awards for literature." The book is called *Nobel Lectures: Literature 1901-1968* (Amsterdam and New York: Elsevier, 1969, 640 pp, \$ 14.50).

*New journals helpful to the study of Comparative Literature*

1. *Studies in the Novel* (quarterly)—North Texas State University, \$ 4.
2. *The Journal of Narrative Technique* (three times a year)—Department of English, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197, U.S.A., \$ 3.00.
3. *Hasidut*, ed. Benjamin Hrushovski—Department of Poetics & Comparative Literature, Tel-Aviv University, Israel. (In Hebrew, but summaries of articles in English.)

VII

*Recent translations from Bengali literature*

Steven Poulos of Rochester University in a review of the Clark-Mukherj translation of *Pather Panchali*, a Bengali novel, says: "The translation . . . is an excellent one and in this edition has become part of UNESCO's Translation Collection." Nowhere is it mentioned, however, that the translated version suppresses the whole last section of the novel on the plea that it actually ends with the third section. (The French translation of the same novel, also sponsored by the UNESCO, repeats the same critical attitude.) Apparently, the reviewer agrees with the judgment of the translators. We do not. In a future number of JJCL we want to publish a comprehensive report on the general quality of recent translations from Bengali literature.

## CONTRIBUTORS

**W.D. McCutcheon**, of the Comparative Literature Department at Jadavpur, taught last year (1970-71) at the School of African and Asian Studies at the University of Sussex, where his teaching included a seminar course on modern Indian literature in English and in English translation, and a series of seven open lectures on Hindu art. He also gave lectures on the Bengal temples and Bengal narrative scrolls at Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

**Robert Antoine, S.J.**, also of the Comparative Literature Department at Jadavpur, has finished a translation of the *Aeneid* into Bengali (in collaboration with Hrishikesh Bose) which will be soon published by Jadavpur University Press. He has also nearly completed a translation of Kālidāsa's epic *Raghuvamsha* into English. At the moment (from August 1971 to January 1972) he is giving a course of lectures at Namur University in Belgium.

**J. Masson**, an American, studied Sanskrit at Harvard from where he received a fellowship to the École Normale Supérieure in Paris to study Sanskrit poetics with L. Renou. He came to India as a Fulbright scholar to prepare a translation of *Dhvanyaloka*, and also produced a study of Abhinavagupta and *shantarasa*. At present he is teaching in the Department of East Asian Studies at the University of Toronto, Canada.

**Hrishikesh Bose**, who collaborated with Rev Antoine on the *Aeneid* translation, teaches Comparative Literature at Jadavpur. He is also the author of a full-length stylistic study of the Sanskrit prose romance *Kadambari*. His article here (in Bengali) is an analysis of the influence of Sanskrit style on the Bengali novel *Kapalkundala* by Bankimchandra Chatterji.

**Professor Amal Bhattacharji** had been engaged for many years on a study of the evolution of the tragic form in European literature from the ancient classical to the 18th century neo-classical age, when he died (in 1970) at the age of fifty-one. This study was to be the culmination of his life-long exploration of European literature in which he combined an extraordinarily rich literary response with a critical and sensitive understanding of the complex forces of society. He believed that the long-established study of English literature in this country should move on to the evaluation of European culture from an independent, modern Indian point of view. For this purpose he widened and deepened his direct acquaintance with European literature by teaching himself Italian, Latin and Greek. The exacting care with which he took up this work prevented him from rushing into print, but inspired the confidence of his students in the Department of English, Presidency College, Calcutta. The present article is part of his intended *maum opus*, of which three other portions completed and published are:

"Anagnorisis and Peripeteia in the First Episode of the *Oedipus*  
in the *Rubindra Bhurati Journal*, Vol. I, July, 1968

"The Rage of Oidipus: A Study of the *Oldipus Tyrannus*" in the *Bulletin of the Department of English* (Calcutta University), No. Series, Vol. V, No. 1, "Macbeth" in the *Shakespeare Commemoration Volume*, ed. T. N. Sen, Calcutta, 1967.

*Itty Datta*, Scottish by birth, Indian by marriage, took her Ph.D. from Oxford University with a study relating English poetry of the 17th century to current interpretations of Nature, subsequently published by O.U.P. under the title *Natural Magic*. She first came to India in the late fifties to teach English literature at Scottish Church College, Calcutta, and later joined the English Department of Calcutta University. At present she is in Delhi working on a book on Western and Bengali mythic poetry.

*Subir Roy Choudhury* was a contributing editor to *Bhuratkosh* (Bengali encyclopedia) and is now working on a Bengali slang dictionary. He has also edited a biography of Henry Derozio, one of the foremost educators of 19th century Bengal. He is at present teaching in the Department of Comparative Literature at Jadavpur.

*Pulinbharti Sen*, the first instalment of whose analytical bibliography of the English translations from Tagore and of Tagore's own English writings was published in *JJCL* 8, is at present preparing a complete variorum edition of Tagore's poetical works, two of which have already come out.

*Sobhanlal Ganguli*, Pulinbharti's  
Rabindrasadan (Tagore mu

*Jagadindra Bhaumik*, who  
publications

isvabharati